

United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a review of reports on Redwood Creek, Calif., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 43. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 44. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, submitting a review of reports as the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal Route, La., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local government and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 201. A bill for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 202. A bill for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 203. A bill for the relief of the Plainview-Rover School District No. 7, of Yell County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 204. A bill for the relief of W. P. Dodds; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 205. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 206. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 207. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 208. A bill for the relief of Marion Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 209. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 210. A bill for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Rainger, Diane Rosser and Roberta Rosser, W. H. Baker, and Mrs. Katherine D. Wert; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 212. A bill for the relief of Werner Zeiss; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 214. A bill for the relief of California Aircraft Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 216. A bill for the relief of John Seferian and Laura Seferian; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 217. A bill for the relief of James E. Monaghan as administrator of the estate of Katherine Monaghan, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 218. A bill for the relief of Florence E. Bower, Hulda Bower, and Christopher Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 219. A bill for the relief of Samuel Stacey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 220. A bill to correct the naval record of Carlo Solone; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 221. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bellia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 222. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Tracey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 223. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rocco Capodilupo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 224. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 225. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 226. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 227. A bill for the relief of Mundo Barchi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 228. A bill for the relief of Robert June; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 229. A bill for the relief of Michael Francis Spillane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 230. A bill for the relief of Thomas Callanan, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 231. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie M. Elben; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty of Capt. Walter S. Strange, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 233. A bill for the relief of Hamsah Omar; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 234. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 235. A bill for the relief of Edward Higgins Doyle; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 236. A bill for the relief of William Thomas Doyle; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 237. A bill for the relief of Mack Skaggs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 238. A bill for the relief of William M. Silk and Henrietta Silk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 240. A bill for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 241. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 242. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Herren; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 243. A bill for the relief of Mose Lee Hogan and Mary Alen Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 244. A bill for the relief of Adell Brown and Alice Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 245. A bill for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 246. A bill for the relief of L. S. Strickland and Mrs. Marguerite Boggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 248. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Wornie Denny; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 250. A bill for the relief of James Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 251. A bill granting a pension to Neva Dobbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 252. A bill for the relief of James T. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 253. A bill granting a pension to Barbara Oertel; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 254. A bill for the relief of William A. Hallett; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 255. A bill granting a pension to Edna P. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 258. A bill for the relief of H. Dale Madison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 259. A bill for the relief of Leo Gottlieb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Easterwood; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 261. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jethro Humphrey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Winkle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 263. A bill for the relief of the county of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 264. A bill for the relief of R. Heine; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 265. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada H. Keith and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 266. A bill for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 267. A bill for the relief of Jack Skarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzinski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 268. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 269. A bill for the relief of Charles Molnar; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 270. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, patient yet fearless, tender yet strong, we would gather at the altar of prayer. In the name of our Saviour who came into this world to die that Thou mightst save it, while others sought to redeem it by the words of men, clothe us with the heart of love and with the spirit of steel. Thou who reachest

the way to the Father of all truth whose holy credentials none can dispute, make us to stand before our country and the whole world as the divine fulfillment of the true measure of righteous men and women.

Blessed Lord, as conflicting motives baffle and unwise appeals approach and seek to dominate, then sustain us with the courageous arm of goodness, with the virility of virtue, and the regnancy of honesty. O Master, let us walk with Thee; forever lure us by the elements of true, upright conduct, persuading us that forgiveness is a higher law of Christian character than resentment; when Thou hadst all power to crush aggression, Thy life was marked with absolute gentleness. As we face the crumbling debris of a world trembling in the palsy of wicked war, let us rejoice that Thou art the unfailing friend of man; emerging from all the surroundings of mystery, Thou art still our strength and shield:

With grateful hearts, the past we own,
The future all to us unknown;
Thy goodness all our hopes shall raise,
Adored, through all our changing days.
Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 28, 1944.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day submitted to the Honorable Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, my resignation as Representative at Large from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to become effective at noon Tuesday, January 2, 1945.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN.

APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS TO COUNT THE ELECTORAL VOTE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers to count the electoral votes the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. WORLEY and GAMBLE.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are present Members-elect whose certificates of election in proper form are on file in the office of the Clerk who were delayed yesterday on account of slow transportation. Those Members-elect will present themselves at the bar of the House and now take the oath of office.

Thereupon Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BUCK took the oath of office.

LYNCHINGS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

XC1—3

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress and every constituent will rejoice in the announcement that in the year 1944 there was only one lynching in the United States.

While two deaths by violence have been referred to as lynchings, one was, the other was not.

At Pikeville, Tenn., a 17-year-old trusty at the Tennessee State Training and Agricultural School, a reformatory, murdered the wife and daughter of the superintendent of the reformatory after attempting to rape the daughter, who was the wife of a lieutenant in the United States Army Air Corps. There was no question of his identity or guilt. He was taken from the jail and shot to death by a mob.

The other case grew out of a dispute as to the ownership of a farm. Six men, three of whom had a tax title, went to the farm and ejected the man in possession, claiming title otherwise, and his son. During the argument that ensued, they shot and killed the father. All six were indicted by the grand jury of Amite County, Miss., for murder. One of them has already been tried; the others await trial.

While, of course, the crime of lynching, even in one case, should not be approved or condoned, no matter how great the provocation, yet we are glad to note that lynching has been reduced practically to the vanishing point.

It must be borne in mind that this reduction, the most rapid in the history of any crime, has been accomplished in the only possible way, by intelligent and local creation, maintenance, and application of local public sentiment.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] was delayed in arriving. If he will present himself in the well of the House, he may take the oath at this time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the program for Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The opening and counting of the electoral college vote will take place on Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And only incidental business?

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect a message in writing from the President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I presume there will be a resolution introduced which will take care of the papers now in the Dies committee so that they may be turned over to the special committee that the House created yesterday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not get the inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will be necessary to have a resolution introduced this week which will take these papers that the Dies committee now has and turn them over to the special committee; otherwise they will go into possession of the Librarian?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a matter that can be disposed of on that day. In view of the action of the House yesterday, I agree that some action should be taken and, of course, the House can take whatever action it wants to even under the statute. My suggestion would be, if I may say so, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and others interested, try to agree on a resolution which will pass the House without controversy.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is my intention to present a resolution to the House, which I understand will be privileged, and to which I do not think any one will object, to hold these files intact and to turn them over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in complete agreement that something like that should be done and something like that is perfectly proper and a reflection on no one. In view of the action of the House yesterday those files should be held intact for the chairman and members of the new committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that had to be done before Saturday or by Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and that is perfectly agreeable to me, and even if it were not a privileged matter I think we should take action on it anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the program for today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever special orders there might be, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, does he intend to follow the practice of skipping legislative days that the House might be in session during the coming 2 or 3 weeks?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the probabilities of any legislation during the next month, as the gentleman knows from experience, is remote. There will be some bills, perhaps, but not enough of them to keep the House continuously in session. As far as I am concerned, the House may meet every day

or if there is no business adjourn over for 2 or 3 days at a time. Naturally, any time I propound a unanimous-consent request I have conferred with the leadership on your side of the aisle. So it is reasonable to assume that during the next 2, 3, or possibly 4 weeks requests of that kind will be made. The gentleman knows that I never make a request of that kind without conferring with the leadership on his side and certainly if I have advance notice of Members having special orders on a certain day I would not make a unanimous consent request the result of which would be to wipe out those orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will take notice of the fact that there will be requests for special orders. I have a few to make myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that I try to cooperate with all the Members of the House on matters of this kind as completely as I can.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the Bronx Board of Trade.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a debate over the radio entitled "How Can We Best Implement Dumbarton Oaks?" I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of the article will be \$364.

I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I delivered over the radio entitled "Palestine—Hope Deferred"; and to insert a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. CEILING ON CATTLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am this day offering a bill to amend the Price Emergency Act to enable the Administrator of the O. P. A. to put a ceiling on cattle on the hoof. We face a very difficult situation in the industrial areas where retail meat dealers, because of ceilings placed on retail prices, are compelled to sell meat products at an absolute loss. At times, as a result of ceilings on retail meat, butchers have been compelled to sell at 5 and 6 cents loss per pound. They are justified in striking and closing their doors. The provisions for subsidies to packers and slaughterers has proved abortive. It is like putting money into a sack open at the bottom. It is

utterly useless. It may be difficult to put a ceiling on cattle on the hoof, but where there is a will there will be a way. It does not make sense to have a roof over cattle products all along the line and not at the source. You cannot limit and hamstring slaughterers, distributors, and retail purveyors and leave ranchers and cattle breeders to roam unmolested. You must have sauce for the goose and the gander.

Ceilings on cattle will be difficult to carry out and administer. Such difficulties are present on many other commodities.

It was suicidal to leave cattle on hoof to open competition. For the duration cattle must be controlled and all cattle products as well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a series of articles by Mr. Ralph Nicholson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have been worrying a bit, and I would like to direct a question to my good friend from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Mr. RICH, in view of his vote yesterday afternoon for the amendment to the House Rules to add a permanent committee which is to continue the Dies committee. I am wondering where we are going to get the money to pay for it.

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, HENRY J. LATHAM was elected to Congress from the Third District of New York last November. He is a lieutenant in the Navy, and was at that time, and is now, on duty in the far Pacific. He will not be able to return to this country to be sworn in until the month of February. I feel, in

justice to his constituents, that I should make this announcement at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, January 8, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that I may have the same privilege on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders previously entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes to answer the question asked me a few moments ago by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes to explain the bill I introduced for the encouragement of small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include part of an editorial entitled "What Does America Want?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article from a Boston newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on three subject matters and to include in one an editorial from the Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I notice by this morning's paper that Mr. Bowles has admitted that the O. P. A. made a very serious mistake in invalidating the stamps a few weeks ago. I am sure the women of the Nation will agree with him. Nothing has happened in many years that has shaken the faith and trust of the American housewives in the Government as the unreasonable and arbitrary action of the O. P. A. a short time ago in ordering an invalidation of many food stamps. If this had been necessary for the benefit of the armed forces nobody would have complained. I am glad that Mr. Bowles has justified the public statement which I made at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to divert and ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], who addressed the House about 2 minutes ago, whether or not he introduced the bill about which he spoke at the request of Mr. Bowles? There are thousands of cattle producers and feeders in the country who would like to know whether Mr. Bowles and his associates favor an order fixing a ceiling price on live cattle as provided in his bill.

The gentleman from New York fails to answer.

I presume he has left the Chamber. Should he chance to read this statement and cares to advise me I should be glad to know.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the conversation that took place a moment ago between the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself, regarding the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have prepared this resolution:

Resolved, That the records and files of the former Committee on Un-American Activities be held intact in the rooms formerly occupied by the said Committee on Un-American Activities and turned over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman from Mississippi has conferred with me about this. I think the action should be taken. I think it is wise to take it today. We might as well do it today as Saturday. The House acted yesterday. Certainly the papers should be kept intact for the standing committee which the House provided for in its vote of yesterday. As far as I am concerned, it is perfectly agreeable to dispose of the matter today. The resolution is worded in a manner that certainly is not controversial, and it carries out the action the House took yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I have just read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 46) as follows:

Resolved, That the records and files of the former Committee on Un-American Activities be held intact in the rooms formerly occupied by the said Committee on Un-American Activities and turned over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I have abso-

lutely no objection, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] whether he has carefully read the statutes, not the Rules of the House, to see if this is in any way in conflict with the statute.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not in conflict with the statute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I have not read all the statutes of the United States, but I have read the statute and the rules concerning this proposition. This is within the power of the Congress, and it is the duty of the Congress. As far as that is concerned, it is a privileged resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. The statute provides that the Clerk of the House shall place in the Library of Congress certain files.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but that is in the absence of any action by the House of Representatives. If this action is taken it will amount to a mandate that will be carried out.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Indianapolis Star written by Maurice Early.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. JENNINGS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Resolution 31, to amend the rules of the House to provide for a report and question period in which heads of departments, agencies and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to appear on the floor of the House to make reports and answer questions. With some modifications, this resolution is the same as House Resolution 327 which I introduced on October 19, 1943, and which was widely discussed by Members of Congress and in the press of the Nation during the last Congress.

THE PROPOSAL

In House Resolution 31, I have proposed that we have a report and question period on the floor of the House of Representatives at least once every 2 weeks, but not more often than once a week. The session shall not last more than 2 hours. During this report and question period a particular member of the Cabinet or the head of an agency

would be invited to appear on the floor of the House and answer written questions, which had already been prepared and submitted to him by the legislative committee issuing the invitation. This procedure would give the chief administrators an opportunity of preparing answers to the questions and the legislative committee would thus be able to direct the course the discussion is to follow. The last half of the question period would be taken up with questions by Members from the floor of the House. The time for questions from the floor would be under the control of the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation. The Rules Committee of the House would fix the length of time for the period which in any case would not be more than 2 hours and the Rules Committee would also fix the priority of appearances in the event more than one invitation is pending at any one time. The oral questions must be germane to the preceding discussion.

I believe that much good would result if administrators were brought face to face with representatives of the people under an orderly procedure in order that the country may have the benefit of a free and open consultation between them.

An examination of House Resolution 31, which I filed on yesterday, and House Resolution 327, which was before the last Congress for consideration, will reveal that I made four changes in the resolution which I submitted to this Congress for consideration. The changes are:

First. The session is called a report and question period instead of question period as originally provided in House Resolution 327.

Second. In House Resolution 327 I intended the definition of "heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments" to cover such agencies as War Production Board, War Stabilization Board, and others. Some question was raised as to whether they were in fact included. I therefore redefined the executive agencies included as "heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments."

Third. In House Resolution 327 it was contemplated that the oral questions during the latter half of the period would be germane to the preceding subject matter. I think it better to make specific provision for this purpose in the resolution and therefore in the new resolution I have specifically provided that the oral questions shall be germane.

Fourth. In discussing House Resolution 327 with experts both in and out of the Government, it was called to my attention that in some exceptional cases the Members of the House might prefer to have information from an Under Secretary or an Assistant Secretary instead of the Cabinet member or head administrator. In the current resolution I have provided that by agreement with the legislative committee which issued the invitation a principal assistant might appear in place of the Cabinet officer or administrator. This, by agreement, would make it possible for administrators such as the Chief of Staff, Chief of Naval Operations, the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of State, or

an Assistant Secretary to appear before the House.

In order to reacquaint the old Members of the House with the details of this provision, and that the new Members of the House may become more thoroughly familiar with it, I have asked for this time to explain the way the resolution would operate and the desirability of its enactment. A similar resolution is being introduced in the Senate by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who will be vigorous in the sponsorship of the resolution in the Senate. The changes which I have above outlined have been worked out in consultation with Senator FULBRIGHT. This resolution was enthusiastically supported by many Members of the House during the last Congress and more than 350 leading daily newspapers of the country editorialized favorably upon the plan. Insistent requests were made for a hearing but we were never able to secure consideration of the resolution during the past session of Congress. There is an increasing necessity and demand for a strengthening of congressional methods and for securing better information by Congress. The American people demand a strong Congress. This is one of the definite methods by which we can meet that demand. I am very thankful that the last Congress saw fit to create the Maloney-Monroney committee. I have been given assurance that the committee will consider this proposal. At the pleasure of the committee, many witnesses will appear before it in support of the resolution.

The plan set forth in House Resolution 31 is intended to make for better, more responsible government. It is intended to be of benefit to Members of the House, to the Executive, and to the public.

NONPARTISAN ISSUE

This is in no sense a party measure, it appeals to no partisan interest, it awakens no party spirit. It is not intended to interfere with, to lessen, or increase the rights and prerogatives of the majority or of the minority.

Before drafting this resolution I consulted with many thoughtful members of both parties. The plan is highly recommended by Democratic and Republican newspapers in all sections of the country. It is strictly a nonpartisan effort to enable us to improve the machinery with which we do business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in this proposition; I have long favored such a thing myself. While Mr. Hoover was President I worked for the passage of a bill of similar nature which had his deep interest, and I discussed it many times with him. Particularly in war it is very important to have those who are in charge of the conduct of the war appear before the Congress. I believe it has been very valuable in England. One reason why England has been strong and able to sacrifice as much as she has is because she has been told hard facts. Last November I asked the Speaker if he would invite General Marshall and Admiral

King to come before us and describe conditions on the battle fronts. We should be told the truth. Of course under present law they could not appear before the House while it was in session, but they certainly could appear if we were in recess, or they could talk to Members at the Congressional Library. I hope and believe General Marshall and Admiral King will appear before us. I renew the request for their appearance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted to have this expression of support of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have known for a long while that she was in favor of the idea. I recall reading a letter from Mr. Hoover to Congressman Clyde Kelly heartily endorsing this plan.

Under the resolution as now presented it would be possible to have the Chief of Staff and the Chief of Naval Operations appear before the House. Many of us present today will recall that in October of 1943 the membership of the House was invited to the auditorium in the Congressional Library to hear Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, and several other military men. We were there like a bunch of school boys, an audience in the auditorium listening to what they had to tell us. In spite of the handicaps of the session, what they had to say was of tremendous interest and importance to the Members of the House; yet we had no opportunity of directing the discussion or asking questions or trying to find out from them about particular matters in which we were interested. Even if this provided nothing more than a session of that kind it would give us an opportunity of seeing these men face to face and hearing what they were doing, what their plans were, how they were carrying out the laws we enacted, and to report on what their departments were doing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has weighed this matter, the joy of the minority party to embarrass the administration when given their opportunity to ask questions in that manner?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman for that question. I have weighed that question very carefully and considered it. In reply, I may say that this does not upset the balance between the majority and the minority in any way whatsoever. The original questions which will be asked during the first half of the period are prepared by the legislative committee which issues the invitations. The last half of the time would be divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee which has charge of the period. It is provided in the resolution that the questions must be germane to the preceding discussion. Let me say in the first place that I do not believe any Member of Congress wants to heckle an administrator just for the fun of heckling. The whole matter is entirely voluntary. If the Executive were asked an improper question—first, it must be germane—but if it were an improper ques-

tion, since he came voluntarily he could and should refuse to answer it if he thought it would do damage to the Government; and in the second place, I have great confidence in the Members of the House doing the right thing. The people of the country are dead serious about this business of government, and if any Member tried to inject something into the discussion that was not proper, he would be condemned by public opinion; so I have no fear about the dignity of these sessions. My experience with the minority, whether Republican or Democratic, has convinced me that its criticism has been constructive and helpful. I believe the minority should have the opportunity of asking questions for the purpose of constructive criticism of plans and proposals of the administration in power.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much what the gentleman has said. The gentleman from Tennessee has stated that the Monroney-Maloney committee that will make a study of congressional procedure is considering this proposal. It may develop that because of the wide scope of the study the committee will undertake that it would be a few months before a report could be made. I feel that the proposal of the gentleman is extremely important in this the very beginning of perhaps the most crucial Congress in the history of the country, and I am wondering if the gentleman and others interested might press for hearing before the Rules Committee without awaiting a report from the Monroney-Maloney committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the observations of my friend from Tennessee. I want to pursue whatever plan that will be most expeditious in giving the House a chance to vote on this proposal. I may say that during the last year and a half nobody could have pressed more vigorously or insistently than I have for a hearing before the Rules Committee.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to say to my friend that as a member of the Committee on Rules I know of no opposition in the committee to giving the gentleman a hearing on his proposal. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman, and very frankly may I say that I am favorably impressed, yet I can understand the importance of the suggestion.

There is one thought comes to me, and that is that we would not want to put the matter of making the program under such control as would take away from the membership the right to propound what individual Members think would be pertinent questions in reference to any pending issue; nor would we want to enter into any sort of a combination or agreement which would make possible the Cabinet members or their representatives coming up here and lecturing the House. My thought is that one of the most important questions, one of the most important things this House should do is to exercise itself to the limit in the

recapturing of powers that have already been filched away from it.

The gentleman is in great earnestness about the suggestion he makes. I know he has given it a lot of thought. I know he has canvassed the best public opinion throughout the country. I am sure that the chairman of the Rules Committee, along with members of that committee, will be very happy to arrange for the gentleman and his colleagues having a full and fair hearing on this resolution at a very early date. I hope this will take place soon because I think a record on the matter should be made for the information of the Congress and the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. May I say that I appreciate the very thorough and patient consideration the gentleman from Georgia has given this proposal? I have had the pleasure of talking with him about it on many, many occasions. In referring to the effort to secure a hearing before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia has always taken the position that he now takes—that he wants us to have a hearing—and he has been most sympathetic and fair in evaluating this proposal. He has expressed interest in hearing the leading students of government all over the country to see what their opinion is on this proposal. In my comments about the Rules Committee, may I say that while I have been most anxious to get hearings on the resolution, I do not mean any personal reflection, of course, on anyone?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has made extraordinary efforts on behalf of the resolution which he introduced during the last session and which he is reintroducing in this one. He seems to be of the opinion that the Rules Committee did not treat him fairly and did not give the consideration to which the resolution was entitled. I may say to the gentleman that the thought uppermost in my mind during the last session of Congress was to expedite the legislation that was needed for aiding our war effort. No Rules Committee in the history of the Congress has reported more rules and resolutions than did the Rules Committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman in the last session. I hope that it will be possible very shortly, and we will be delighted, to give him a hearing. But it is impossible to hear everybody at the same time, especially when we have from 50 to 100 resolutions pending.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. May I say that the gentleman has been very kind to let me make my request for a hearing, with an opportunity of presenting some of the most eminent men in the United States before the Committee on Rules on this proposition, to try to convince the members or to try to point out the pros and cons of the proposition? May I say further to the gentleman that I think nothing can be of more benefit in the prosecution of the war than an understanding between the

Members of the Congress and the heads of the executive departments as to our war program and how it is being prosecuted? And this resolution, under its operation, would certainly make for that. Of course, the Rules Committee has been very busy, and I have a high regard for its capable chairman and for the members of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I ask the gentleman if they gave any consideration to the fact that under the parliamentary system in Europe the members of the Cabinet, so called, are selected from the House of Commons, the members of which are elected by the people? In this case, of course, you can have a Cabinet officer come before the House who has been selected, but many of whom could not be elected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. I say that without reflection. They are not close to the people at all. I think that is something that this Congress ought to consider very seriously. If you had a Cabinet system by which they were selected from the House that, I think, would be very different, because they would be coming directly from the people.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. May I say in answer that all the good things that we could get from the British system and fit into our own congressional system, we have tried to include them, but our system of Government is so different that not much benefit is to be derived when considering this measure by comparing the question-hour of the British House of Commons with the proposal here. It is true, as the gentleman says, that Ministers of Government in Britain are members of the House of Commons. They derive their authority there, and they are on the floor and they have to make good or they can be discharged. But the proposal of House Resolution 31 is largely for the purpose of securing information and finding out what the Cabinet members are doing. They would come up to the House for a particular purpose, of giving information; they would give information and answer questions and they would be here for no other occasion. Of course, the gentleman is thoroughly familiar with the fact that in the first Congress, in setting up the Treasury Department, it was provided that the Secretary of the Treasury may be required to make a report in writing or orally at any time he may be called on by the Congress. We require the Secretaries to make written reports. All we are doing here is to ask that in addition to filing these voluminous reports, which none of us read and which none of us have time to give consideration to, that we invite them on purely a voluntary basis to come here for the particular purpose of telling us what they are doing and what they plan to do in connection with the laws that we pass, give us their answers, let us see what we think of what they are doing,

and then they are not expected to remain on the floor. It is purely a matter of giving information on a voluntary basis.

Mr. REED of New York. I think we could do that before the proper committees without having them come before the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I say in connection with committee matters the trouble is we can hardly keep up with matters before our own committees. I cannot keep up with everything before my committee. Maybe the gentleman can be fully informed of all matters before him. He is an exception if he can.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish I could.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But many matters have important appeal to the whole membership of the House, and not just some particular committee; the big matters of state transcend the interest of any one committee. On questions of foreign affairs, on price stabilization, and all these great issues, where they run administrators from one committee to another, the membership of the House never gets the whole picture, and I think it would be much better for the whole membership if the committee having jurisdiction could invite the Cabinet member up here to explain the whole situation to the House. It would just really amount to doing part of the committee's work on the floor of the House and giving the Members of the House at least a workable knowledge of the subject matter.

The gentleman very well knows, too, unless the bill is reported favorably, other Members of the Congress never have an opportunity of reading the committee hearings, and it may be months and months afterward in that case before they have an opportunity to read the hearings. It is a post mortem. A bill is brought in here. The hearings are frequently 2,000 pages long, in fine print. Nobody is expected to and nobody could possibly read all of the committee hearings on the legislation that is considered, so we want them to come here and give us the essential facts about their departments and their plans and how they are carrying out the laws we pass.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Personally, if I do not commit myself by what I am saying now, I am pretty thoroughly convinced that our system has worked admirably for 150 years. I am not one of those who are inclined to try something new all the time. I think that when we get a written report from a Cabinet officer, every Member of the House has an opportunity to examine it thoroughly. Then it is a matter of public record. I think that system is preferable to having men come up here and indulge in a lot of oratory before the House on something on which certainly 435 Members of the House are not each going to have an opportunity to ask the questions they would like to ask. I believe the present system has worked pretty well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the gentleman will study this matter further before he decides against it.

Mr. REED of New York. I intend to do that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it has merit, and many Members of the House do, too.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Since our system does not provide, as the gentleman from New York suggested, for the selection of Cabinet members from among the elected representatives of the people, and since it is rather important that Cabinet members be in close touch with the people for the best administration, would not this proposal in some sense compensate for the fact that they are not elected by the people, by bringing them in closer touch with the representatives of the people?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. Every Cabinet office is set up by Congress. We have a right to have their reports and know what they are doing. I think we owe it to ourselves to get firsthand information from the departments which are established by this Congress as to what they are doing and how they are administering the laws we pass. And through us they would have an opportunity of keeping in closer touch with the desires of the people as the gentleman suggests.

NO CHANGE IN BALANCE OF POWER OR OF TRADITION

I avow at the outset that this resolution is not intended to infringe on the spirit of our Constitution. It is not intended to upset the balance of power between the divisions of our government. It does not interfere with the so-called separation of powers. I do not seek to substitute, now or eventually, the parliamentary system, or any other system, for ours. I do not seek to either aggrandize or impair the Executive power as defined in the Constitution and vested in the President. I do not seek to give the Congress any undue or unconstitutional power over the Cabinet members and heads of departments. The Cabinet members are selected by the President and their service can be discontinued by the President. It is not the intent of this resolution to alter their legal relations either to the President or to the Congress.

The resolution only seeks to confer upon them a privilege and a duty. The privilege is to give them an opportunity to explain their departments, their problems, and to give us their advice. The duty is to give us current facts and expert information face-to-face, which will help us with our problems, which will enable us to legislate with better information and, therefore, more intelligently.

The report and question period provided for in the resolution is intended to be an occasion which will be carried out in an orderly fashion—an occasion of benefit to the Members of the House and to the executives alike. I do not want the executives to be subjected to heckling or improper questioning. I am sure this will not occur on these occasions. I am certain that these periods will be most useful and that proper decorum will be maintained by all parties concerned.

WOULD BE OF ASSISTANCE TO COMMITTEES

What this resolution really proposes, is to enable the committees to do an important part of their work on the floor of the House. As matters now stand, there is no adequate procedure where the average Member of Congress can get a necessary working knowledge of the organization of the big executive departments. We have no workable way of learning about the problems or of ascertaining the make-up of the various divisions of the bureaus. We have no way of keeping currently advised of the manner and method they pursue in administering the laws we pass. Better information along these lines is necessary if we are to legislate intelligently. Under this proposal a committee could make its work easier if it had this means of informing the entire membership of the House of the organization and problems of the departments over which it ordinarily has jurisdiction in legislative matters.

If nothing else is done than to have the committees bring in the heads of the departments to explain to the membership of the House the organizational plan of the departments, what the various divisions do, what laws they would administer, how much personnel they have, how they deal with the public, the difficulties they encounter, and their general problems in trying to do a good job, I feel that the resolution would be justified. Certainly we have no easy method of getting this information under our present set-up.

For instance, several committees are interested in the problem of disposing of surplus property and war plants when the war is over. Mr. Jones was on the Hill several times in one week to discuss this matter with various committees. This is a problem that transcends the jurisdiction of any one committee; it has ramifications in which every committee is interested and the subject matter is one of importance to every Member of the House. So, why wouldn't it be well for us to make it possible for some committee to invite Mr. Jones to appear on the floor of the House and explain the matter to all of us? It would certainly save him a lot of time and his analysis of the facts and of the alternatives in meeting the problem would enable the membership to have an easier grasp of the issues and of how they should be solved.

HOUSE MEETING WITH SECRETARY STIMSON

I have been thinking about this matter a great deal. Many of you will recall that on October 19, 1943, the membership of the House was invited to the auditorium in the Congressional Library to hear reports from Secretary Stimson, Under Secretary Patterson, and General Marshall. What they had to say was valuable and interesting. As I recall, the session lasted from about 9:30 until 12:30. The Members of the House had no opportunity to ask questions or to direct the course of the discussion. We were there to listen to what was said. Most Members of the House were interested in particular and special problems but we had no machinery for bringing out the facts about them. I thought how much more valuable it would have been

if the discussion could have been under direction of the appropriate House committee and on the floor of the House, and if machinery had been established so that the committee, and even a Member of the House, could have participated. It was on that date that I filed the resolution now under consideration.

MUST CONSIDER NEEDS OF AVERAGE CONGRESSMAN

The average tenure of a Member of the House is a fraction over two terms, so over a course of years the majority of votes cast by the House are by men who have been here slightly over two terms. We must consider, in determining whether our machinery is adequate or not, the question of whether that machinery enables the second-term Congressmen to become acquainted with the ramifications of the departments, the policies of the departments, and to find out whether they are doing their job as was intended by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very much interested in the proposal of the gentleman. But having been here for quite a few years, I have always noted, particularly has it been true during the last 12 years, the strong control that the Executive has over the majority party. That was particularly true during the first 10 years of the present administration. A good many pieces of legislation came up here from the Executive which went to the committees where they were not given much consideration, and were passed in the House here without a great deal of consideration or explanation. It seems to me that what the gentleman proposes will, in a large measure at least, attempt to eliminate that pressure, and the lack of understanding on legislative matters submitted by the administration. Of course, that would break down the administration's control over the majority party.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that the resolution is not intended to interfere with the rights or prerogatives of the executive departments. I think this is true, speaking very frankly, that we would have much better executive departments and more capable heads of departments under this system because, in the first place as the matter now stands, the executive heads have their press conferences and that is about the only time they reveal what they are doing.

If a head of a department or a Cabinet member were faced with the responsibility of coming up here on the floor of the House and of testifying what he intends to do, human nature would cause him to be more careful in the decisions he makes. Human nature would require them to follow more closely the congressional intent in administering the laws

which we pass because they would be here at the place where the money comes from and they would want to make a good showing, both before us and before the public, or they would be liable to stand in bad public repute. Another thing which it would accomplish with respect to the executive departments is that they would have to make policy decisions before they came here. In many cases, I know—and it has always happened; I am not talking about this administration only—you never can find out exactly what the policy of an administrator is on a particular subject. It may be one thing today and something else tomorrow; and perhaps different branches of the bureau will have different policies. So when they come here to define their policies and to stand at the bar of public opinion they are going to have to make their definite policy decisions. They are going to have to be men and women who understand the departments they administer and they are going to have to have the full facts in order to give us a clear report. I think it would be a great benefit to the Congress. It would greatly restore the prestige of Congress to have considerable information about the decisions of executive branches given here. I do not think it would necessarily interfere in any way, except in a healthy way, with the relationship between the party in power and the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with what the gentleman has had to say, that it would put these policy makers on guard, but would the gentleman go a step further and institute the parliamentary system, wherein if these officials did not follow the intent of Congress, a vote in Congress would throw them out of office?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Not at all. I would not want to institute any such policy. However, if these men did not make a showing, then public opinion would remove them, and the Congress would take care of them in the matter of appropriations, so that we would not need the power of dismissal.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would they have to come here?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under this provision, it is a voluntary matter. There is a constitutional question as to whether you can make it mandatory on a Cabinet member to come before Congress. Apparently the First Congress did have that idea, that it could be made compulsory. But, in any event, they would come so long as they were treated properly, and they would be treated properly. What position would a Cabinet member be in, if he was in good faith asked to come here to give a report on some matters that the Congress was interested in and the public was interested in, if he refused to come? His political life would not last long.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it the gentleman means along the line of an occur-

rence during recent months, where a committee of Congress wanted certain information, and a representative from an executive department replied to the committee that he was precluded from giving that information because of executive edict. Assuming that it was a matter in respect to the war, for instance, and that the Congress asked the Administrator, or the Secretary having charge of that matter to appear before the Congress and the representative of the executive department said no, that he did not want to do that, because that was a matter about which the Congress should not be advised at the time, because it might interfere with carrying on the war.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say that those occasions would happen very infrequently, and the power of public opinion would provide a solution. If it were some matter that cannot be stated publicly, I am sure the House would not want the question to be answered. If it were a question that should be answered publicly, and there was no reason for not doing so, and the administrator would not answer it, then he would fare very badly in public opinion. The dignity of this proposed session, the fact that it is public, and that it is a matter in which the whole Congress, the House of Representatives is calling for information, unless it were something that could not be stated, I think there would be no difficulty. Further, if it were a matter of secret information we could have an executive session of the House under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to be understood as opposing the gentleman's resolution, because I think there is much good in it, even if nothing comes from it further than what has already transpired. I think the effort has been worth while, because we notice by the press this morning that this action, and similar action on the part of the House and the Senate in asserting themselves, is bringing about a condition in which the executive has advised they are willing to talk through Mr. Byrnes, or somebody else, so that there may be no misunderstanding between the Congress and the executive about these things in which the people are interested.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no question but what the executive has established the precedent. I recall from Clay's Notes of the first session of the Senate of the United States the Executive, President Washington, attended one of the meetings at the invitation of the Senate but left in disgust. In substance he stated that from that point on each of the branches of government should confine itself to its particular sphere of operation. That is observation No. 1.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary

and one of the really great historians of the United States in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Unquestionably, as suggested by the gentleman, the writers of our Constitution anticipated that heads of the departments would come to the Capitol and advise with and report orally to the Senate and to the House. There is no real argument about that because in the very first Congress, in which sat many, many members of the Constitutional Convention, and of course the President of the United States, George Washington, had also been President of the Constitutional Convention; in the very first Congress, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, President Washington went personally to the Senate to advise with the Senate on a treaty with the Creek Indians. He went on a Friday. He was kept sitting around all day Friday, all day Saturday, and was asked to come back Monday. He was treated rather coolly and he vowed he would never come back there. But the writings of Washington clearly indicate that he thought it unfortunate that direct oral liaison was not carried out as intended by the fathers. But it was lost on that occasion and it was very unfortunate. I will say further to the Members of the House that we have some 24 records of appearances by members of the Cabinet before one or the other of the legislative bodies during the First Congress; and, of course, the first law setting up the Treasury Department intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would sometimes be called upon to come before the Congress and make oral reports, but on account of the incident I have referred to the procedure was abandoned by the First Congress just as Jefferson stopped addressing the Congress in person on the state of the Union. That was not revived until the time of Wilson. I believe this would be a very good time to revive this matter of the appearance of Cabinet members.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. First of all, I wish to compliment the gentleman on the great work he has done. I, like the gentleman from Michigan, am not opposed to the gentleman's proposition, but will the gentleman answer this question: In view of the delegated powers given by this Congress to the Executive, and in view of the fact that many of those powers have not been returned to the Congress, have we any standing with the members of the Cabinet to invite them here? Are they not secure in their legal standing and position in view of the powers heretofore delegated to them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is true we cannot discharge a Cabinet member for he is se-

lected by the President and can be discharged only by the President. It is in our power, however, to abolish the office, and it is in our power to invite them to appear; and they would appear.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the event we should invite them here and they crossed our threshold and then talked us down, would we have lowered the dignity and standing of our own group, the House of Representatives?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It will work out so that we shall have greatly increased the dignity and standing of the House of Representatives, because these gentlemen will have to make a good impression. The big news of the Nation would come from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Have we not great power in our control over the purse of the Nation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have great control through what the law says.

Mr. GRAHAM. And through control of the purse strings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We can exert further control by refusing to appropriate. I have no fear but what they would cooperate to the fullest extent and in coming up here would give us full information. I thank the gentleman for his questions.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been very vigorous and effective in sponsoring a plan similar to this for many years.

Mr. THOM. I may say that the success of the system we are proposing depends largely on the questions. The questions must be fair, they must be free of accusation, they must be free of suspicion of the motives of any Cabinet officers. In the English Parliament the question must first pass the muster of a clerk. Certain standards have been set for the questions, and they must comply with those standards. The whole proposition is to see to it that partisanship is excluded and that you have a true question propounded in good faith.

H. R. 327 VASTLY DIFFERENT FROM PENDLETON PLAN

A recent Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of the people interviewed are in favor of the plan set forth in this resolution. Only 7 percent were against it. Yet, in Congress, I know there is a larger adverse percentage. The trouble I have had is that some Members are inclined to be against this idea because they have in mind the old resolutions on this subject and they have carried over their prejudices against the old ones to this one.

This proposal is so different from that presented by Congressman Pendleton and by President Taft that I doubt the value of comparing it to these previous plans and yet the prejudice is there—based upon the Pendleton-Taft pro-

posals. Also, since it may be charged that this idea is not in keeping with our precedents, it is at least of interest from a historical point of view to examine these precedents.

PRECEDENTS FOR PLAN

Our founding fathers never intended that the three divisions of our Government should work in watertight compartments. Rather, I think our Constitution intended that some consultative custom be worked out. There is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit this being done. The branches of the Government are separate but each branch affects the workings of the other branch. It was never intended by our Constitution makers that the divisions of Government should be kept separate in a strict and actual sense. The founding fathers, I think, intended that some procedure like this should be inaugurated. In the law organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, it made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to "make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature, in person or in writing—as he may be required—respecting all matters which may be referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives or which shall appertain to his office."

In the debate on that bill it was expressly objected to that it might lead to the introduction of all the Secretaries on the floor but the bill was nevertheless passed and without so much as a denial, that such would be the result.

Nor has history been without illustration of the necessity and of examples of this practice. In the early days of the Government the Secretaries were repeatedly called to the presence of either House for consultation, advice, and information.

Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 51.)

Saturday, August 22, 1789: The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber, attended by General Knox (Secretary of War), and laid before the Senate the following statement of the facts, with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 66.)

And again on the Monday following the President and General Knox were before the Senate.

Friday, August 7, 1789: The following message was received from the President of the United States, by General Knox (the Secretary of War), who delivered therewith sundry statements and papers relating to the same. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 684.)

Monday, August 10, 1789: The following message was received from the President by General Knox (Secretary of War), who delivered in the same, together with statement of the troops in the service of the United States. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 689.)

There are about 14 instances when a member of the Cabinet appeared before the Senate during the First Congress. There are 8 instances cited in the Congressional Globe of appearances before the House. The record is not clear as

to just what took place on most of these occasions. It is fair to say that in most instances the Cabinet member acted largely as a courier.

WASHINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BELIEVED IN CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS

Historians usually say that Washington did not like the treatment he received before the Senate on one occasion and decided he would not go back. The record shows that he was kept waiting 2 days on one occasion when he was asked to appear. This may have been one reason for his discontinuing the practice of consulting with the Senate. It is clear, however, that Washington thought the practice in line with the Constitution and with our form of government.

In the Executive Journal of the Senate, volume 1, page 55, it appears that on August 4, 1790, President Washington sent a message to the Senate communicating the draft of a secret article to be incorporated in a treaty with an Indian tribe. The message closed with these words:

If the Senate should require any further explanation, the Secretary of War will attend them for that purpose.

This, mind you, was a message from the Father of our Country, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention.

In the debate over the establishment of the Treasury Department no one objected to the provision which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report in person to either branch of the legislature if the legislature chooses, on the grounds that this provision violated the Constitution or was not in keeping with our precedents. Mr. Madison was there and raised no objection to this provision. Later on, when Mr. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, had a report for the funding of the national debt which he wanted to make in person to the House of Representatives, a lengthy debate over his proposed appearances took place. This was during the Second Congress. It was decided to have Mr. Hamilton submit his report in writing. The decision was made principally on the ground that since the report was detailed and dealt with many figures, that it would be of more benefit to the Members of the House if delivered in writing. Perhaps the real reason Hamilton was not allowed to present the report in person was due to the antagonism between Hamilton and his followers and the followers of Madison.

PERSONAL REPORT ON STATE OF UNION PARALLEL IN HISTORY

A parallel in our history is that President Jefferson discontinued the practice of addressing Congress in person. When this practice was revived by President Wilson, a considerable stir was raised on the theory that personal appearance was not in keeping with our tradition. It was not a violation of any tradition at all; President Wilson was merely reviving a good policy which had been abandoned for more than 100 years. It was a policy open to the President under the Constitution. In the same manner the proposal here is a device open to us by

the wisdom of the men who wrote our basic law.

EXPERIENCE OF CONFEDERATE STATES

It is of historical interest to review the action taken by the outstanding men who wrote the Constitution of the Confederate States. I think we are far enough away from the Civil War so that we from the South can be grateful that the Union was preserved, and those from the North can appreciate the ability and genius of some of the leaders of the Confederacy, such as Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Alexander Stephens. Alexander Stephens, in spite of ill health, was one of the great statesmen and brains of his times. In the convention to adopt a constitution for the Confederate States, Mr. Stephens was chairman of the committee on rules. The provisional government of the Confederacy adopted a resolution reported by Mr. Stephens that the heads of departments be admitted to the floor of Congress both in secret and in open session.

The idea was later written into the permanent Constitution of the Confederate States, in the following language:

Article 1, section 6 (2): No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the Confederate States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments of which have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office. But Congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either House, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

The Confederate Constitution was very similar to the Constitution of the United States. It followed the idea of the three separate powers. Its framers did not believe it would adversely affect the functions of the three separate divisions.

The Confederate Constitution was unanimously approved by a group of outstanding Americans—delegates were there from all the States of the Confederacy. Mr. J. L. M. Curry, a distinguished member of the convention from the State of Alabama, in his book *Civil History of the Confederate States*, tells the reason why this innovation was put in the Confederate Constitution:

Anyone familiar with public life in Washington knows that, under some administrations, there has been an injurious lack of sympathizing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments, and especially between members of the Cabinet and committees of Congress, concerned in matters of mutual interest. The absence of facility of communication often proves a bar to the easy and better working of the Government.

One of the outstanding authorities on government of those days was Alexander Stephens, of the State of Georgia. In his opinion the lack of consultation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches was one of the weaknesses of the Federal Government. He makes a very strong argument for the plan adopted in the Confederate Constitution in the excellent book which he later wrote. The improved procedure had been actually practiced under the

provisional Federal Government of 1861, but because of conditions created by the war the plan was never fully carried out. Jefferson Davis, in his book *The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy*, stated:

This wise and judicious provision, which would have tended to obviate much delay and misunderstanding, was never put into execution by necessary legislation.

PENDLETON RESOLUTIONS

In 1864 a bill to permit the heads of the executive departments to occupy seats on the floor of the House was reported unanimously by a select committee headed by Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio. The urgency of the Civil War rendered it difficult to secure attention to the subject, although the debate revealed strong support for the measure by many distinguished legislators such as Mr. Garfield, afterward elected President, and Mr. Blaine, afterward Speaker of the House. Later, during the forty-sixth session of the Congress, a resolution was introduced by Mr. Pendleton, then a Senator, to make it possible for heads of executive agencies to appear on the floor of the Senate. This resolution was referred to a select committee of seven, which unanimously reported the resolution. The committee was composed of three Democrats and four Republicans and its membership was made up of men whom it would be difficult to surpass for ability and statesmanship. The signers of the report were Senator Pendleton, at one time Democratic candidate for Vice President; Senator James G. Blaine, who was twice Secretary of State and later a Republican candidate for President; Senator W. B. Allison, who was for 35 years a Member of the Senate; General M. C. Butler, a Confederate veteran and a major general of the Spanish-American War; Senator James T. Farley; Senator John J. Ingalls; and Senator Orville H. Platt.

I could give you hundreds of recommendations by former Members of Congress, executives, historians, and other prominent Americans, urging favorable consideration of this means of communication. I will name only a few of our leaders who have advocated this procedure and will read short extracts from some of their statements in favor of it. These men are good authorities upon whom we can rely. In their statements are found many good reasons for the adoption of this system.

CONTEMPORARY SUPPORT

President Howard Taft, in his message to Congress made December 19, 1912, made a forceful argument for adoption of this proposal. He said in part:

There has been much lost motion in the machinery of Congress due to the lack of cooperation and interchange of views face to face between the representatives of the Executive and the Members of the two legislative branches of the Government. It was never intended they should be separated in the sense of not being in constant effective touch and relationship to each other. The legislature and Executive each perform its own appropriation functions, but these functions must be coordinated. I do not think that I am mistaken in saying that the presence of the members of the Cabinet on the floor of each House would greatly contribute to the enactment of helpful legislation.

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, in 1924, when Secretary of State, said:

It ought to be possible for Cabinet officers to take part in debate in both Houses on matters touching their departments and thus be able to give exact information and to defend themselves against unjust attacks. Under the present arrangement a Cabinet officer often hears of misunderstandings and of an outpouring of mistaken notions which a brief statement from him would have corrected, but the misapprehension has been voiced and has gone through the country perhaps never to be overtaken.

We can preserve the advantages of stability and enhance the opportunity of executive leadership, not by overriding the cherished prerogatives of the Congress or by attempting to gain an illicit advantage for the leadership but having a recognized contact through the regular admission of Cabinet officers to the floor of the House of Congress.

The late Elihu Root wrote, April 20, 1935:

It has long seemed clear to me that we ought to have some arrangement under which Congress would have the benefit of more prompt and authoritative information as to the action of the executive department.

On the other hand, I think that a sense of liability of prompt explanation has a very good effect upon the head and the leading members of an executive department.

The Honorable John W. Davis wrote, March 19, 1936:

I have always thought it would be a good thing if members of the Cabinet were given the privilege of the floor of either House of Congress.

Congress, having control of its own procedure, can undoubtedly inaugurate such a system if it wants to. I am not sure that each House could not do it on its own account. One of the greatest advantages of the attempt is that it could be abandoned if it proves a failure, without any permanent amendment to the Constitution.

I do not remember that I have ever discussed the subject in any public address, but I am quite willing to be quoted in favor of the experiment.

President James A. Garfield said:

Who does not know that the enactment of such a law will tend to bring our ablest men into the Cabinet of the Republic? Who does not know that if a man is to be responsible to his executive acts and also be able to tell why he proposes new measures, and to comprehend the whole scope of his duties, weak men will shrink from taking such places? Who does not know that it will call out the best talent of the land, both executive and parliamentary? It is the silent, secret influence that saps and undermines the fabric of republics, and not the open appeal, the collision between intellects, the array of facts. I hope that this measure will be fairly considered. If it does not pass now, the day will come, I believe, when it will pass. When that day comes I expect to see a higher type of American statesmanship, not only in the Cabinet but in legislative halls.

On another occasion President Garfield said:

I have long believed that the official relations between the Executive and Congress should be more open and direct. They are now conducted by correspondence with the presiding officers of the two Houses, by consultation with committees, or by private interviews with individual Members. This frequently leads to misunderstanding, and may lead to corrupt combinations. It would be far better for both departments if the members of the Cabinet were permitted to sit in Congress and participate in the debates

on measures relating to their several departments—but, of course, without a vote. This would tend to secure the ablest men for the chief executive offices; it would bring the policy of the administration into the fullest publicity by giving both parties ample opportunity for criticism and defense.

President Woodrow Wilson, Committee on Cabinet Government? *Overland Monthly*, volume 3, third session, January 1884, page 25, said:

Cabinet government would, moreover, put the necessary bit in the mouth of beast caucus, and reduce him to his proper service, for it would secure open-doored government. It would not suffer legislation to skulk in committee closets and caucus conferences. Light is the only thing that can sweeten our political atmosphere—light thrown upon every detail of administration in the departments. . . .

It cannot be too often repeated that while Congress remains the supreme power of the State, it is idle to talk of steadying or cleansing our politics without in some way linking together the interests of the executive and the legislature. So long as these two great branches are isolated, they must be ineffective just to the extent of the isolation. Congress will always be master, and will always enforce its commands on the administration. The only wise plan, therefore, is to facilitate its direction of the Government and to make it at the same time responsible, in the persons of its leaders, for the acts of control and for the manner in which its plans and commands are executed. The only hope of wrecking the present clumsy misrule of Congress lies in the establishment of responsible Cabinet government. Let the interests of the legislature be indissolubly linked with the interests of the executive. Let those who have authority to direct the course of legislation be those who have a deep personal concern in building up the executive departments in effectiveness, in strengthening law, and in unifying policies; men whose personal reputation depends upon successful administration, whose public station originates in the triumph of principles, and whose dearest ambition it is to be able to vindicate their wisdom and maintain their integrity.

Committee government is too clumsy and too clandestine; system to last. Other methods of government must sooner or later be sought, and a different economy established. First or last, Congress must be organized in conformity with what is now the prevailing legislative practice of the world. English precedent and the world's fashion must be followed in the institution of cabinet government in the United States.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and one of our greatest authorities on American government, in his excellent book, *Is America Worth Saving?* at page 60 had this to say:

The business of National Government has become so huge and so complex that the sharp separation of the executive and the legislative powers to which we have been accustomed for 140 years, is now distinctly disadvantageous. It brings in its train lack of coherence and of continuity in public policy; it conceals from the people much that they should know, and it prevents effective and quick cooperation between the Congress and the executive departments, both in times of emergency and in the conduct of the ordinary business of government. There is a way to overcome these embarrassments and difficulties without in any way altering the form of our Government or breaking down the wise safeguards which the Constitution contains. That is to provide by law, as may be done very simply, that the members of the Cabinet shall be entitled to

occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to the business of their several departments, under such rules as the Senate and House, respectively, may prescribe. Such an act should further provide that the members of the Cabinet must attend sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives at designated times, in order to give information asked by resolution or to reply to questions which may be propounded to them under the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Were such a custom to be established an almost certain result would be the selection as heads of the great executive departments of men of large ability and personal force—men able to explain and to defend their policies and measures before the Congress of the United States in the face of the whole country. It would also follow that the Nation's Legislature would be enabled to exercise a more intelligent and a more effective control over the executive departments than is now the case, as well as to render them more intelligent and more effective aid in the form both of appropriations and of positive law.

When Representative Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania, became the champion of the proposal, in the course of his campaign for it he asked the views of Mr. Hoover, then a Cabinet member. In replying, June 23, 1922, Mr. Hoover said he believed this one of the most constructive steps that could be taken in furthering the development of our political machinery.

There are in my mind overwhelming arguments that can be introduced in favor of this change in our traditions. I do not believe that any fundamental criticism can be directed against it except by those who would deliberately exaggerate it as an attempt to establish a form of parliamentary government. Anyone who understands the basis of such European organization will at once recognize that the step you propose has no relation whatever to this form of government.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, the noted historian, stated:

This (requiring Cabinet members to attend Congress) should have a wholesome influence on both departments of government. Again and again Congress enacts laws in vague and general terms, leaving interpretation and application to executive authority. In such cases it frequently happens that the administrator departs, or seems to depart, from the intention of the legislation, assuming that it was ever clearly formulated. The Members of Congress attack the administration on the floor and the administration fires volleys through the press at Members of Congress. Not an edifying spectacle. More than that, it delays, confuses, and hampers the transaction of business. Every issue of this character should be defended on the floor of Congress with the parties in interest face to face, the press watching, and the country informed.

Justice Story, *The Constitution*, section 869, said:

The heads of the departments are, in fact, thus precluded from proposing or vindicating their own measures in the face of the Nation in the course of debate, and are compelled to submit them to other men who are either imperfectly acquainted with the measures or are indifferent to their success or failure. Thus that open and public responsibility for measures which properly belongs to the executive in all governments, and especially in a republican government, as its greatest security and strength, is completely done away. The executive is compelled to resort to secret and unseen influences, to

private interviews, and private arrangements to accomplish its own appropriate purposes, instead of proposing and sustaining its own duties and measures by a bold and manly appeal to the Nation in the face of its representatives. One consequence of this state of things is that there never can be traced home to the executive any responsibility for the measures which are planned and carried at its suggestion.

Another consequence will be (if it has not yet been) that measures will be adopted or defeated by private intrigues, political combinations, irresponsible recommendations, and all the blandishments of office, and all the deadening weight of silent patronage.

H. R. 327 AVOIDS MANY OBJECTIONS MADE TO PENDLETON PLAN

Before drafting this measure I read all the congressional debate in the various Congresses on the so-called Pendleton-Taft plan. That plan, set forth by bills and resolutions, simply provided that heads of agencies and departments should have a right to sit on the floor of the House and participate in debate affecting their departments. The plan also provided that on certain days they should be required to appear in the House or Senate and answer questions.

The principal objections to the Pendleton-Taft plan were that it required attendance by the administrators. Many felt they would interfere with the work of Congress by being on the floors of Congress a great part of the time. Some felt the plan would exalt Congress over the executive. Others felt it would take too much time of the executives. Other Members felt the plan would supplant committees. Some felt it would give the executives too much influence over Congress. Some felt it would be the entering wedge of the parliamentary system. Others were fearful that the sessions would not be orderly and might be used for partisan or heckling purposes.

I feel that many of the arguments against the Pendleton-Taft plan had some merit, so in drafting this proposal I tried to meet the objections that had been made. You will observe that attendance under H. R. 327 is voluntary. The administrators come to the floor of the House for a particular purpose and it is not expected that they will be there at any other time. The sessions will not be an undue burden because they are limited to one a week and only one administrator will appear at one session. An administrator only comes when called by a congressional committee. He only comes to give information. The resolution also endeavors to establish an orderly procedure which will avoid heckling or personal embarrassment.

The need of closer collaboration between Congress and the administration has frequently been felt and voiced in the course of our national history. So long as the United States was half empty, prosperous, and well protected by broad oceans, the old idea of the balance-of-power system was tolerable. But now that the Nation is crowded, harassed by serious social and economic problems, and deeply involved in world affairs, better teamwork between the legislative and executive branches of our National Government is essential to our welfare and

security. No item on the present agenda of democracy has a higher priority than that of inducing closer, stronger, steadier cooperation between the President and the Congress in promoting the welfare of the people of the United States and the United Nations.

Effective cooperation between the two great political branches is indispensable for successful government, which is what we need in these crucial times—government equally effective for the waging of war and the organizing of peace.

We are coming into the most important, complex, and challenging period of world history. The problems of government are not going to become easier—they will become more complicated. If we are to keep pace with the executive departments, if we are to legislate intelligently, and if we are to meet the great domestic and international issues coming before us, we must improve our system of securing information, keeping up with the administration of laws, and we must find a way of having closer teamwork between the executive and the legislative departments, particularly in the field of foreign affairs.

ANNUAL REPORTS NOT SUFFICIENT INFORMATION

The way we are supposed to keep up with what the departments are doing, under the present system, is by reading their annual reports. These reports are voluminous—those who write them tell us, to some extent at least, what they want us to know. With all the duties on a Member of Congress, very few of us have time to read these reports. Besides, they do not keep us currently informed. I think no one will argue that these reports are sufficient.

PRESENT COMMITTEE SYSTEM NOT SUFFICIENT

It is said that we have necessary contact through the committees. I find it very difficult to attend all the meetings of the one committee of which I am a member. Under the rules, we cannot join in the work of the other committees, and, besides, it is physically impossible to do so. Frequently 10 or 12 committees will be having hearings on the same day. It is said that committee reports should keep us currently advised. This we know is not true, because, in the first place, the committee reports are only about legislation on a particular bill. There are many things about which we need information not covered in any committee reports. We need information about the departments, the administration of laws, whether the intent of Congress is being followed, and above all, we need to be kept currently informed in the field of foreign affairs.

If a bill is not favorably reported by a committee, the hearings may never be printed. Even if they are printed, it is humanly impossible for any Member to read all the hearings. They are voluminous, contain many tables, and the hearings on an appropriation bill are frequently more than 2,000 pages in length.

The present committee system tends to make the members of a particular committee experts on the subject matter handled by that particular committee. The system does not operate to give the Members necessary facts needed for passing on national or international problems. What is needed is a system

like the one proposed here to supplement the committee procedure, which will give the Members a better picture of the big over-all issues which we are confronting. This would tend to make the Members more nationally and internationally minded.

I asked the Library of Congress to give me information during the Seventy-seventh Congress on the number of resolutions for investigations filed during that Congress. The number they reported is 217; the requests for specific information from departments, and so forth, 37; and we have continued 16 special investigating committees. They say that probably they did not get all of them. The 217 requests for investigating committees certainly show that the Congress is in bad need of expert, detailed information. I am sure the necessity for a lot of these committees would be obviated if we could have the administrators up here, find out what they are doing, and get them to tell us about their plans and let them know what we think about it.

The present committee system, as it operates in considering big matters of general importance, works a hardship on the administrators. Several committees will be inquiring into the same matter and each committee will call the head of the department before them and he will give substantially the same statement to each committee. Mr. Jeffers appeared before five committees during 1 week. Mr. Nelson and Mr. McNutt were before several House committees and gave substantially the same testimony during 1 week. One appearance on the floor of the House in each of these cases, in which the administrator would explain the war-production problem, the war-manpower problem, or the rubber problem—as the case may be—should have been sufficient. One House hearing would have reached all the Members of the House, whereas several hearings before several committees only reached a small percentage.

Dozens of resolutions for the creation of investigating committees are filed during each session of Congress. The fact that these resolutions are filed shows that the Members are seeking information and it shows a desire for knowledge of facts. During the last Congress we authorized the appointment of several select committees to make special investigations into the way executive departments are carrying out their functions. After a law is passed, we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee made a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could invite the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, ask them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

IMPORTANCE OF CONGRESS WOULD BE STRESSED

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken

by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House, pursuant to questions from Members, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

EXECUTIVES WOULD DERIVE GREAT BENEFITS

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President in making appointments would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House. The President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government. The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decisions if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to give facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and explaining his side of the controversy.

POLICIES WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED BY EXECUTIVE

In a complex society such as we have today it is necessary to concentrate great and far-reaching power in the executive. This condition will continue regardless of the administration in power. One of the great values of having Cabinet members and administrative agents report in person to the Members of the House is that such appearances would necessitate clear definitions of policy on the part of the executive. Some Cabinet members and heads of agencies do not know what the President's policy is on certain particular matters under their jurisdiction. This is no reflection on the present administration, as the same condition has always existed. Before an administrator appeared at a question period he would naturally call upon the Chief Executive to clearly define the policy of the administration in regard to the matters about which he would be questioned. Also, many questions of policy which should be decided by the administrator himself remain undetermined. Faced with the invitation of making a personal report to Congress, the administrator would be running a great risk if he did not settle those undetermined matters of policy affecting his department before submitting himself to the House Members for interrogation.

Would not it be of great help to the Members of the House if Mr. Byrnes and others were given an opportunity of explaining their thinking and the original ideas of their committees relative to demobilization? After the war we may have to have some kind of international currency agreement. How many Members of Congress know the details of the various plans proposed or the intricacies of the problems of

international currency? Would not it be of interest if the Banking and Currency Committee would invite some administrator to the floor of the House to tell all of us what is being thought of and planned in the matter of international currency?

OBJECTIONS TO PLAN ANSWERED

In this discussion I have answered some of the objections that have been or may be made to this proposal. It is said that allowing executives to consult with Members on the floor is not in keeping with our tradition or with the spirit of our Constitution. Under the Constitution each House makes its own rules. There is ample precedent in the early days of the Republic for this kind of thing. Each House admits a chaplain to open the proceedings with prayer. By the act of 1817 each Territory has a right to send a Delegate to the House who can participate in debate. This Delegate is not a Member of the House. I do not see how the presence of the Delegates adversely affects the tradition of the House. I think it is very wholesome to have them here to tell of the needs and problems of the Territories. The House admits contestants in election cases to present their claims on the floor. It has even admitted their attorneys.

Some Members claim that this should not be adopted because it is something new. Can no progress be made because we are afraid to try new methods?

Remember, this can be done by a simple change in the rules of the House. If the practice does not meet our expectations we can repeal the rule. In that case the Nation would at least give us credit for trying to improve the tools with which we work. The people want us to do that. They want a strong Congress—one able to hold its own with the executive departments; one which will secure the available facts before it legislates on any issue.

BALANCE OF POWER NOT AFFECTED

It is claimed by some that this might upset the balance of power or the so-called separation of powers. It will do nothing of the sort. It is only a means of securing information which is open to us under the Constitution. The departments now do not work in watertight compartments. Each division of the Government affects and has considerable influence over the others and it was never intended that we should not communicate and exchange information and advice for the good of the country.

"APING ENGLAND" ARGUMENT RIDICULOUS

Another argument always effectively used against any plan of this kind is that it might be "aping England." Our system of government is so different from the English system that a comparison is of little benefit. Yet, when the Pendleton plan was about to be adopted in 1864, Congressman Cox of Ohio put on a show as to how we would be copying the English and the measure was defeated. Under the parliamentary system the ministers lose their seats when Parliament does not sustain their position. Under our system the right to select and discharge Cabinet officers is solely in the President. Furthermore, we can never

have the parliamentary system, in view of the constitutional provision which says that no Member of the Congress can hold any executive position. In England, however, the ministers, as you know, are members of Parliament.

Every representative form of government except ours has some direct means of communication between the executive and congress. It might as readily be said that we are copying any of these other systems. Besides, if we can get a good idea from the British, or any other nation, which we can fit into our system, I think we should accept it. After all, the English common law, the Bill of Rights, and habeas corpus were great institutions, and they have meant much to the American people.

It is said that the annual reports of the departments are sufficient. We know as a practical matter that this is not true. What would you think of a corporation if the directors and stockholders could only communicate with the management officials in writing? We would rate this kind of set-up as foolish and inefficient.

It is said that the committee system gives us necessary contacts. As presently operated, I know that it does not. If supplemented with this resolution, so as to give the committee an opportunity to acquaint the whole House with the organization, personnel, and problems of the departments, the committee system would be capable of filling the bill.

Under this resolution there would be no opportunity for the Cabinet members to exert undue influence over the Members of Congress. They would come on the floor of the House for the specific purpose of giving information. They would only be here during that time. If they have a good plan and can persuade us that it is good, I cannot see how any harm is done, and, likewise, if we do not agree with them after giving them a hearing, no harm is done.

WOULD NOT BE HECKLING PERIOD

It is said by some that this would resolve into a heckling period. Those who say this, I think, overlook the fact that every Member of the House is here for a good purpose and wants to do his best to represent his country and his district. The people now are dead serious about this business of better government, and they will not long countenance any Member using this occasion for political or improper purposes.

The press of the Nation, as evidenced by more than 350 favorable editorials, is on the whole strongly for this improvement and the press would deal harshly with any improper use by a Member of the House. Furthermore, I think the resolution has ample safeguards to prevent heckling. If more are needed, I am in favor of adding them.

Furthermore, the procedure set up in H. R. 31 is wholly voluntary. The administrator does not have to appear in the first place unless he wants to. Since his appearance is voluntary, he could, by the same token, refuse to answer an improper question. Furthermore, if any substantial part of the membership of the House should become so devoid of decorum as to try to make these appearances

heckling sessions, the administrator would not be expected to appear. The public would certainly not want him to under such circumstances.

CONCLUSION

To sum up—if Congress wants to hold its authority, if the House wants to keep pace with the executive departments, if the House wants to meet the expectations of the people of this country, we must improve our machinery. I think this plan is worth trying. I think it would work to the benefit of Congress, the departments, and the people. If it does not, the committees do not have to issue any invitations and, furthermore, if we do not like the way the system works, we can repeal the rule. Let us at least give it a trial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may follow the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATE OF THE NATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to wish all of you and your families and all the people who are associated with you a very happy New Year. Many of you may be a little bit fooled with that statement because you thought I was going to first ask you, "Where are you going to get the money?"

It is certainly a very great question, I assure you.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I stood in the well of this House to address the Members I made my farewell address. At that time I thought I would never be privileged to return to the House of Representatives because I had served 12 years, which is about one-sixth of a man's lifetime and that that was sufficient service for me, but events have taken such a turn that I am returning here as a Member of the Congress again; a great privilege and a great honor. I have been sent back by the people of the Fifteenth District of the State of Pennsylvania. I have made no promises of any kind to any citizen. I did not ask for any favors in coming here, so that I am free to do that which I believe is for the best interests of this great country of ours, and for all of our people, of all classes, of all religions and faiths.

I come here for the sole purpose, God being my helper, of keeping this country under the form of government which our forefathers have established and which they have asked us to perpetuate for our children and for our children's children. I realize full well that this country today is in the most serious position it has ever been in all its history. We have a great responsibility, a great job on our hands. We are at war and I do not want to do anything, I do not want to say anything,

that will hinder the war effort or an agreement on peace by which we can bring our boys back to America at the very earliest moment. That will be my responsibility and purpose. However, in order to successfully conduct the affairs of this country and the war in which we find ourselves, we need to do the things in our country that will preserve the democracy which we have all loved for so long and which we want to perpetuate. It is the greatest heritage that we as Americans have, it is our great privilege to have liberty, independence, and freedom for America, and for the American people.

I hope that nothing will interfere so that our liberties will get away from us. But I am so exercised in the things that have transpired in the last 12 years that I am afraid our liberties are getting away from us very, very fast. I say with all the sincerity that I know that the form of government which we knew 10 or 12 years ago is getting away from us, and if we do not look out we are going to have a form of government such as you and I would not want to possess. If such a thing were to happen that our form of government be changed you may say, "Oh, I did not want that form of government. I do not know why it has come about." I say that the reason it has come about—because I have lived with it during those years—is due to the things that you do here in the House of Representatives; a little bit here and a little bit there on each one of these bills, giving power to the Chief Executive that should be retained in the hands of the Congress of the United States and to the citizens of this great Nation of ours. Permitting law by Executive order rather than laws of the Congress.

I hold in my hand the statement of the United States Treasury dated January 1, 1945. It shows that today we are in debt \$232,163,996,653.87. When I left the Congress 2 years ago that indebtedness was \$57,838,123,096.94, on December 31, 1941. In other words, you have increased the indebtedness of this Nation of ours \$174,225,873,556.93 in 2 years. That means over \$7,000,000,000 a month in the red—I say to you where are you going to get the money?

Let me go back and just look at the statements that were made by the Chief Executive in 1932. I am only going to read one, but I have a book here that is filled with them, sound statements, statements that are good, but today only water over the wheel—broken promises. They have not been carried out. May I read one statement that was made in Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932, by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt?

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Now that was a fine statement, a true statement, a wise statement.

Why did he forget it so soon when in 1934 they started to spend and spend and spend and elect, elect, and elect?

Oh, what a shame—oh, what a mockery and scandal it has become.

I say that we are on the road to bankruptcy today. I am sorry, but some of you might say, "Oh, that is because of the war." Oh, no, no, no. For 9 years before the war this administration had a deficit of from one and one-half billion to five billion dollars a year, and it did not do anything about it then, notwithstanding the promises that were made by the Chief Executive. I have nothing personally against the Chief Executive. I have nothing personally against anybody. But I do not like a man to say one thing and do another. If I did that, I know what you Members would say about me. I have tried to be honest with you and I am going to be honest with you, and I am going to start right in at this session just where I left off 2 years ago. I have not been sorry for anything I voted for in those years. I did it because I believed it was right and just.

I am going to vote that way now, but I do not believe in sitting idly by, because I came to Congress, and permitting things to go on in this Government that are going to wreck us or that are going to tear us down or that are going to make us lose our form of government, and we are doing it and doing it every day. You know it, but you do not stop it nor prevent it.

Marvin Jones, as reported in this morning's paper, says we have to raise more food not only for our own people and our own Army but for the other peoples of the world. Mr. Byrnes says we are going to draft the boys that are on the farms. Where is there any sense in that? How can you produce more food-stuffs on the farms with less people to work the farms?

You may say, "Where are you going to get the men to fight the war?" If you need food, you need men on the farms to raise the food to furnish it to the people who need it. You may say, "Where are you going to get these people?" I would start right here in the Government offices in Washington and I would get some of the people in the offices of Government, and get them mighty quick, and I would send them back on the farms or in industry or war work, and let them do something that would be worth while for the winning of this war.

Let me show you now what happened with respect to the employees on the Government pay roll. All the time I have been here in Government, notwithstanding the statements that were made by the Chief Executive—and he said before he was elected that he would consolidate the bureaus and eliminate them—he has established more offices and bureaus; he has built up the greatest political machine that was ever known in the history of the world out of Government employees all over this land and in every State of the Union. He has done that for no other purpose, in my judgment, after seeing what has happened, than to have workers all over

the United States in order that he might have this political machine. True, they do work for the Government, but I contend there are too many worthless jobs. The end does not justify the means.

When he went into office on March 4, 1933, we had 563,847 Government employees. That does not include the Army or the Navy. Today we have over 3,250,000. We have established all kinds of bureaus in this city. In the Labor Department alone, whenever one bureau did not function we established another, until we have gotten more bureaus in that Department than are necessary by any stretch of the imagination. We have them in the Department of Agriculture, we have them in the Department of the Interior, and we have them in every other department of government.

If the Members of Congress would try to do what is right and do it quickly we would send these people back into industry, and agriculture that is going to help win the war, and get them out of Washington. You can hardly go to a restaurant and get a meal; there are so many people here they are falling all over themselves.

I realize there are many people in Government who are working hard, but there are many things in Government that are unnecessary at this time. When Mr. Roosevelt took office in 1933 it cost about \$6,000,000,000 a year to run the Government, and we took in about \$4,800,000,000. It is costing us today over \$97,000,000,000 a year to run Government, and we are taking in about \$44,000,000,000. I am speaking here in round figures. I am not trying to give you the actual data; I will give you that later on before the year is over. When we know we are doing everything we can to win this war, and when we know we have so many functions of government that are unnecessary, we should strip this Government to the core of all unnecessary bureaus, and get these people back on the farms or back in industry, where they can do something to help win the war. That is your job and it is my job and I am ready to do it. What do you say?

I want to say to you men now, I have listened to some of the men who made tours of the foreign countries, both in the Pacific and Europe and Asia. If the people of this country knew what was going on, many of us would sit here and just shudder for the things that we are doing which are not consistent with winning this war. Then when I think today of the promises which were made by labor that we would have no strikes, and when strikes are happening all over the country, and when we have the radical labor leaders today who are out trying to foment strikes just because perhaps some manufacturer did not give them the tools that they wanted, and they call a strike I shudder. Let them wait until the soldiers return and things will happen, but it may be too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Strikes today should have no place in our Government, even though they might be what some people term, worthy strikes. "Arbitration" is the term of the day. But there are so many of them that are just created by conditions which are not consistent with good, sound business on the part of labor or on the part of management. When you think of what these boys are going through, who are lying in foxholes, giving up their lives to defend the democracy which we have, it seems to me that everybody should do what they can to aid them. That means everybody; it means you men in Congress and it means the men on the assembly lines in industry, and it means the farmers and the mechanics, and it means the people in shops. Nobody should be excluded today from doing their duty to their country. All loyal Americans will cooperate.

I have only been given 5 minutes but I will be here again. The gentleman from Connecticut a while ago called my attention to something while I was talking to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] and he wanted to know why I voted for the bill yesterday to make a permanent committee to discover subversive activities in this country. My reason was to keep America American and get rid of all subversive activities against our Government.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. No; the question was, Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. Oh, the question was, "Where are we going to get the money?" Oh, excuse me. Well, I have tried my best to show you by economy in government where you can get a lot of it, but it has fallen on ears that have been deaf. The money necessary for this committee will be good, sound business and will save us much money. In the past when I wanted you to economize in government operation my words fell on the ears of many people who think of nothing but spend, spend, spend. It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives should have a meeting with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and get together and decide how much we are going to have to spend before we spend it. It is up to you Members of Congress; it is up to each and every one of you when you think here of voting for things that you are going to put into effect, as to whether this Nation can stand it without going into bankruptcy. I will say to you this, that all the bombs that have been dropped on those cities in France or in Germany or in some other foreign country are going to be calm alongside of the bomb that is going to be dropped on this Nation whenever we find out that with all the money to finance not only our own Government, not only our own war, but the entire war and all the things that all the nations in the world are expecting of us; it will be a bomb that will rock the world, when we

fall financially. When our people are going out and promising the people of all nations things that we are going to be unable to fulfill and going to be unable to cope with, we have to be mighty careful. We have got to be honest. That is the thing we ought to bring home here to every Member of Congress. Do not spend foolishly if you have not anything to spend. Do not commit yourselves to something you cannot do. Stop squandering. It is time to be frugal; it is time to think; it is time to act.

If you are not honest with yourself, if you are not trying to do the best for this country, then, you ought to resign and get out—I do not care whether you come from the Democratic side or the Republican side, or whom you may be. I say this to you, and it is the last thought I have today, that if I were the Speaker of this House, with the majority leader, whether it be on the Republican or the Democratic side, I would try to find some means whereby we could have a roll call before the Chaplain asks divine blessing. I would have in here Jewish rabbis, Catholic priests, our own Chaplain, who would cooperate with them; I would have in ministers of other denominations, and I would ask the Members to get themselves in the right spirit of brotherly love and kindness. If we are going to solve the problems that are coming before us, I think there is nothing more essential to the welfare of the world than to ask God's divine guidance and his aid and assistance in this great time and this great trouble that now faces us. A good prayer meeting will help us all, it will help you and it will help me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the financial bankruptcy of the Government, about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] spoke, is bad enough, but there is something worse than that, and that is the moral bankruptcy toward which our people have been drifting, into which they have been forced by this administration and its political allies.

All during the campaign, and for some time before—yes; for 2 years or more—repeated attempts were made to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives. This campaign of vilification was carried on by the *Daily Worker*, the *New Masses*, by other communistic publications, by the *New Republic*, *PM*, the *Chicago Sun*, and others who are apparently working to perpetuate the New Deal. Practically all of their propaganda was made up of untruthful statements, though once in a while they would wiggle in a half-truth.

Yet, yesterday, when the question of setting up a permanent committee to continue to investigate subversive activity came up in the House, there were those who said that it was nothing but an act of bigotry, the result of prejudice. In this noon's issue of the *Washington Daily News*, under the name of Thomas L. Stokes, I find the following, among other statements:

Then the dedicatory spirit of the opening of Congress was spoiled by one of those actions bespeaking the prejudices among us that seem to come boiling to the top in time of war.

This was when Representative RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, shoved through a change in rules which will perpetuate the Dies committee as a regular standing committee of the House. It was done despite the defeat of three members of the old committee, in elections in which the issue was raised, and the voluntary retirement of Representative Dies himself; despite an apparent agreement among leaders not to revive the committee, and despite public reaction against the character-smearing of that committee.

No one was ever more mistaken in his conclusions. Those who voted to establish that committee are neither bigoted nor prejudiced, but they do believe it is their duty to keep those who would destroy constitutional government from boring from within. They know of no reason why left-wingers, parlor pinks, New Dealers—who advocate the remaking of America, who prophesy the destruction of private business and hope the procedure will be bloodless; any or all of those who do not believe in constitutional government—should be permitted to carry on their program in secrecy. If the people want their program, all well and good; but let us have it out in the open, so we all know what we are doing.

Congressmen have been through three elections since the attack began on the Dies committee, and if anyone knows what his constituents are thinking about, what the people of the Nation are thinking about, it is the fellow who stands up on election day to be counted in or out. Most of those who voted for the resolution yesterday know what it is all about. Even the majority leader said he would vote for the establishment of a special committee. Those of us who have been anonymously lied about, falsely accused of a lack of patriotism, believe it no more than fair that the source of the money which pays for those lies, the men who originate and circulate them, should be known. If they are honest citizens,

no harm has been done. If they are convicts or ex-convicts, the people are entitled to know the source of the publicity.

Yesterday, when the House determined to make that committee a permanent standing committee of the House—not to extend the life of the Dies committee as one or two radio commentators said—we did what our people wanted us to do, but what the Communists, the New Dealers, the P. A. C., and some racketeers in the C. I. O. did not want; and that fact is shown by the C. I. O. publications.

In the issue of *PM* which was on the newsstands this morning there was a story which was captioned "Dies' ghost already stalks new House."

The story continued:

The Seventy-ninth Congress was off to a dreary start today.

In its first order of business, the House, by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats, voted to set up a new standing Committee on Un-American Activities whose authority and scope will exceed that of the discredited and repudiated Dies committee, long since presumed dead.

It was an appalling congressional opening for hopeful citizens who had concluded that the new House would be better than the last. The debut gave dire promise of what was to come when the legislative session really gets under way.

The truth is that the action yesterday was brought about by a coalition of Members who believe in constitutional government, who are all fed up with the mouthing of the Communists; the misstatements and the downright lies set forth in publications like *PM*.

The action was a demonstration that this Congress does not propose to be either kicked around or led around by the nose by a small group whose chief interest lies in other countries, who wish to transplant from the dead or dying civilization of the Old World, the seeds of that decay.

The action is a promise that at least here in America there has been set up a permanent organization in the House which will let in the light of publicity upon the activities of those who heretofore have desired to work in secret—in the dark.

The vote would have been much larger in favor of the resolution, had it been brought up by resolution to create a special committee. Not a few on both sides of the Chamber preferred to have a special committee created rather than to have a standing committee, but the patriotic drive was so strong that it overrode the administration and the majority leadership of the House.

The Reds and the radicals can yell their heads off but there is a possibility, yes, a probability, that from now on they will be made to answer for their lying, sneak attacks and that the disunity that results from their vicious propaganda will be laid on their own doorstep, where it belongs.

It is all right to take 20,000,000 young Americans and send them across the seas, many of them never to return; yes, that is all right in the minds of some, but it is wrong to let the people know

who is wrecking our war efforts, preaching racial prejudice, creating disunity, and why that is being done. Carrying on a war is one way to fight subversive activities; but when this House proposes to establish and keep in existence here a committee to watch these fellows here at home who originate and carry on these subversive movements, expose those who would destroy this Government, the organizations—one of which, like the P. A. C.—that is the organization that boasts it is going to control Congress and stated in its official publication that it had 101 members, I think it was, in the present Congress, the Seventy-ninth Congress—I am on the list of those it is going to get next time, although they failed twice to get me—an organization that is headed by a Russian-born man who, if he says what he means and what he writes, does not believe in the Constitution at all, does not believe in our way of doing things—cry that the Congress should not expose the men behind it.

The people of the Nation, if I get their sentiments right, will rejoice in the fact that the House yesterday established that committee, in spite of all that criticism, as a permanent committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman aware that the Russian Government recently approached a large American shipbuilding concern and offered them a big contract providing they would sign up with the C. I. O.?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I saw it in the press, and the press ordinarily—and I am now drawing a distinction between columnists and news reporters—the press ordinarily in its news reporting is accurate, reliable; seldom does it make a mistake.

Then Mr. Stokes goes on and says:

The vote was close but bigotry won the day.

Well, Mr. Stokes better go and read a little—he might start in with the Bible, then come on down to the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution. He will learn some things he should know—more accurately remember some things he does know. Now, Mr. Stokes knows that the 207 Members of the House who voted for the resolution are not bigots. He knows very well that the minority leader is not a bigot. Stokes was just slinging words around and that right carelessly.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry; I have not time. Yes; I will, at the request of the gentleman from Minnesota, yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman. Does not the gentleman believe it is setting a dangerous precedent to make permanent committees of that character? There is no telling how many investigating committees may be strung out

during the years, committee after committee of this same nature, made permanent committees of the House. If it could be done in this instance, it could be done in others. Does not the gentleman also believe that in this matter of controversial issues it would have been far wiser had there been longer study and debate before the vote was taken?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to the gentleman's question about the time, I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania—I believe it was Mr. EBERHARTER—state on yesterday that we ought to have more time to study this matter, but in the next breath he said he had been studying it for a year and a half. If a person cannot make a decision in a year and a half, then there is no use in putting it off longer. Moreover, the House can abolish the committee at any time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute. We have committees on this, that, and the other subject, permanent committees. We have a permanent committee on the disposal of what is it—waste paper?

Mr. KNUTSON. Useless papers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Useless papers. Right now saboteurs who were abroad in the land are in custody. Discovered only the other day were two Nazi spies who landed on the coast of Maine. Throughout this country not a day goes by that there is not a stoppage of work by strike in a war industry. Do you think Congress should sit here and let the Communists in any organization work underground or in the open without any action on our part to stop them or expose them?

Then we have this move to bring the farmers back from the service and put them on the farm and the talk about drafting the IV-F's for war work. What I am wondering is, if the organization which supported the gentleman from Alabama in his reelection, the P. A. C., which claimed to be responsible for his return to Congress, which has promised to defeat me at the next election, having failed in two previous ones, I am wondering whether that organization which seems to have a voice in the administration here, if we bring back the farmers, if we put the IV-F's in service, I am wondering whether that organization is going to demand that they become members of the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. before they go to work in war industries; whether it is going to demand that the Army, as the C. I. O. today in Chicago is demanding, collect from the employees of Ward's \$1 a month for 13 months as past dues so that the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. may turn over a part of those dues taken by force out of the pockets of the workers for a campaign fund, as they did in the last election for the reelection of the present occupant of the White House, will insist that the farm boys, the IV-F's, join up, pay up, before they go to work making guns? Should

not the House have a committee—yes, legislation—to make it possible for the father, the mother of a soldier, to work in a war plant without being required to pay tribute to a political organization?

Now, so far as Avery is concerned, I hold no brief for him. One of these fellows asked the other day, Are they going to bring that man Avery back and put him under the draft law—reclassify him? What service could he render to the war effort? Bring them all back in, then put them under the jurisdiction of the political organization controlled, as it is, by Communists. That would be the result of their program.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason in the world why we in Congress should forestall any action of that kind by that organization or any other. The official declaration of that organization, and I do not refer to the P. A. C., I refer to its controlling element, the Communists, denounces religion and declares there is no Deity. It states that the ministers and the priests are hypocrites and frauds. Do you not think it is time that we get after and keep watch of those organizations which attack Christianity? Name the members, officers, and the sources of their income and how expended. Would you wipe off the dollar that old motto "In God We Trust"? Would you not open the House with prayer? If you follow the Communists in the P. A. C. you would do away with the churches. The time to fight those organizations is now. We let them run on for 2, 4, and 6 years and they have grown ever stronger. They have taken control of the majority party and they have frightened the daylight out of a large number of Republicans who would like to oppose them. In a year or two you will find in this House only those who always vote with them. They have turned on Members of this House who have gone along day after day with them. Well do I remember the gentleman from Pennsylvania who served in the last war as a major, who was criticized by them, and another Member on the majority side because of one vote cast in the House. In a publication put out by the C. I. O. there was the statement that they had more respect for me because I had always opposed them than they did for the two "double-crossers" who had failed them. But those gentlemen were honest and patriotic, and they at no time double-crossed the C. I. O. They had gone along with the C. I. O. time and time again, they went along with them until the day came when their conscience and their patriotism told them they had to vote against legislation sponsored by that organization. They did. What did they get? What did Members on this side get in the last election? There were men who had gone along with the C. I. O. month after month. What did the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFOLLETTE] on our side get? He got opposition at the polls as a reward. What did 40 or 50 other Members who had stood up for the C. I. O. get? Nothing but bitter lying opposition. No; they want someone to always go along; and if you do not go along with them, and perchance they change after you vote for them, you are

still in the wrong column. You are the victim of their hate, their political opposition.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The State Department permitted a great many Germans to go back to Germany. In this morning's paper the statement is made that this was done against the wishes of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I. Why should such action like that be taken, why should there be conflict between two great branches of this Government if there were not in these branches of the Government certain people who need watching by the committee that we set up here yesterday to continue the investigation of these subversive activities?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know why those men were permitted to go back or why they were sent back. I do know that high-ranking members of the administration are continually fighting each other. I do know that the majority of us who opposed the P. A. C., who fought the Communists and the New Deal during the last 2, 4, and 6 years, were lied about and vilified throughout the past campaign.

And I do know that most of the false propaganda that was put out was intended to destroy the confidence of the people in us and that it was anonymous—much of it in violation of State laws, because the name of the author was not given.

Those campaign documents were conceived in secret, born and circulated in the dark. They were so rotten, so vicious, that no decent man or woman could be induced to put his name upon them as the author or the sponsor.

I do know that in my own district the P. A. C. had a man for months living in the district, controlling and directing the campaign, and up until the last Friday before election in the headquarters of the largest county, which gave one-third of the votes in the district, in the Democratic headquarters, there had not appeared a single piece of Democratic campaign literature. It was all P. A. C., every bit of it. They covered that district from house to house, the rural routes as well as city deliveries.

They published 6 different pieces of propaganda filled with their lies and falsehoods—one a 16-page illustrated pamphlet on book paper; others, full-page ads in the newspapers; and just the Friday before election, a 4½-page mimeographed release, 42 lines on each page, was delivered from house to house and thrown about the streets of the towns and cities in the district during the nighttime. It contained deliberate falsehoods. It questioned my loyalty. It set forth that the people have begun to wonder "just how big a bulldozer and a 'booby' he may be." It viciously attacked Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dewey, and others, and the only signature on it was "The People's Democratic Committee."

I am well satisfied that it was never put out by any Democratic organization in the district, and no one has been able to trace the source from which it came nor who circulated it, for it was thrown

about in the doorways and on the sidewalks—yes, in the public highways—during the darkness of the night.

And the people answered all that propaganda by giving the Republican candidate for Congress a majority 5,000 votes greater than that received in any prior election. All of which PM and any publication or group engaged in the spreading of subversive propaganda might note shows the people's desire that the activities of the Dies committee be continued.

The Dies committee may have made mistakes; it may have issued some statements which were not truthful, which were erroneous. But its record of accuracy, of truthfulness, will compare at least favorably with that of the O. P. A. or the administration.

The Dies committee was able to put the finger on subversive propaganda and its authors and if, at times, it could not locate the membership cards of some who were charged with being Communists, we might well excuse it, as we recall that at the moment no one seems able to locate the Atlantic Charter, to tell us who signed what.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should they have Democratic literature in the headquarters? They have taken the Democratic Party over. Why duplicate their efforts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps I should not criticize the P. A. C. or the Communists for doing that. That is natural. That is a part of their customary deception. That is a part of their fraudulent practices. My only point is that the time has come to fight those who are fighting us and fighting America.

Thank God for the Dies committee, for the disclosures it made, for the good it wrought, and thank God and Congress for establishing a permanent committee of the House to search out, detect, and expose subversive activities, subversive propaganda, and those who make possible its publication and circulation by financial contributions.

The action of the House yesterday in adopting the Rankin resolution was a distinct contribution to the war effort and will, by the people, be so regarded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from General Reybold.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial appearing in the

Brooklyn Eagle, and in the other to include the remarks of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs at Vatican City, December 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I delivered on Christmas day over Station WNOE, New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

SHOULD CONGRESS INVESTIGATE ANTI-DEMOCRATIC ACTIVITIES IN AMERICA?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to discuss the same subject that has been spoken of by two previous speakers in the House today. My task is a bit more difficult than theirs was, because I think a profound problem faces the Congress in connection with the action that was taken on yesterday, just as I think a profound problem confronts our country in connection with this whole matter of the proper effective defense of democracy in America.

America is engaged in the greatest war in all the annals of history. She is pouring out her blood in that war, as well as her treasure. The American people have fought wars before. Being an American, I may be prejudiced, but it is my honest belief that America has fought to a much greater extent than any other nation in the world for ideals, and less for national gain.

If I interpret the feeling of the American people correctly today, I think their main hope is that by the victory which ultimately will be won in this war we will win for ourselves and for the world an era of justice and freedom and lasting peace. I believe that the American Nation wants to see all nations free to choose their own governments, without outside interference by any nation. On another occasion I would like to address the House on that subject. I am not going to speak about it today.

I think further than that that America is fighting this war in order to prevent a great danger from engulfing the world, a danger which threatened it and almost overcame it, and which at one stage but for the dogged courage of millions of unheralded and unsung people in the slums of London and other English cities might have dominated this world. That danger was that philosophy of government which held that a clique in power in the nation had a right to ride roughshod over the religious beliefs, the political desires, the economic welfare, and everything else in the individual lives of their people; that same clique claiming the right not only to dominate their own people but the

right to ride roughshod over nations weaker than themselves.

It is against that philosophy of government, the philosophy of a concentration of power so intense as in the course of time to become, we feared, almost irresistible, that America fights this war.

What are the fundamental things we seek to preserve? Constitutional democratic government. What does that mean? It means government by majority rule. Yes; but it means government by majority rule, always checked and guided by the right of minority opposition. It means a government of elected officials who from time to time—and to us it may seem rather frequent—go before the bar of the opinion of the people of their districts or the Nation, as the case may be, in order that those people may decide whether those particular officials shall continue to serve or not.

Constitutional government means something else. It means that there are certain fundamental rights which each citizen has a right to claim and which the highest authority of government itself cannot take away from him. It means the right to worship as one sees fit. It means the right to hold freely one's religious beliefs in order that one may hold them sincerely and earnestly, because only when a person holds them freely do they mean anything to him. It means the right to economic liberty, the right to economic opportunity free of monopoly control or domination from any source.

Finally, it means political liberty. It means the liberty of a man who does not happen at the moment to agree with the majority of opinion to hold views contrary to that majority of opinion and still be considered a patriotic citizen of the Nation. You cannot sweep away any of these liberties without ultimately imperiling every last one of them.

All human progress, everything America is or stands for, is the result of the courage and the vision and the willingness to suffer of pioneers, pioneers in the settlement of land heretofore unsettled, pioneers for religious freedom, for political freedom, for economic emancipation. Those men were reviled and persecuted in their day. It was Thomas Jefferson who once said a good many years ago, speaking of money in this Nation:

The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government, where it belongs.

That was Jefferson. For views like that and other views about the rights of man, Jefferson in his day was condemned and vilified, only to see in our own day, as I believe he does, his great name enshrined perhaps higher than almost any other in all the annals of American political philosophers and statesmen.

Therefore, I am concerned that, since the House on yesterday, by the vote of the majority thereof, voted to establish a standing committee to investigate un-American activities, that job should be done in the way it ought to be done. I voted against the motion on yesterday. I voted against it for several reasons. First, because I believed it premature

because I thought we should have taken time to profit from past experience and to start the work in as effective and careful a way as possible. Second, because I believe that a committee of this particular sort ought not to be a standing committee of the House. My reason was not that I felt that there was any objection to having this work continuously carried on but rather that it seems to me that work of the character of this committee will be called upon to do is primarily concerned not with legislation but with exposure. The House from time to time ought to have opportunity to pass judgment upon the work of such a committee and decide whether or not it believes the work is being well done, a thing it will not have the opportunity to do in the case of a standing committee. Furthermore, I emphatically do not subscribe to the idea that, in the hands of the leadership of this House, there was the slightest danger of anything happening to the records of the Dies committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I was one who voted for that resolution and I, too, am like the gentleman from California in feeling that this should not have been a permanent standing committee. Although I feel that it is so essential to have a committee of that kind continue the work at this particular time since we, as the Congress, can do away with that committee whenever we find that there is no work for it to do.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is all water over the dam. The House has spoken and I want to speak about the situation as we now confront it, not as I might believe it should have been. There is one thing that such a committee has to be extremely careful not to do. If such a committee of the House can ever be accused of an attempt to interdict freedom of political thought in the United States, that committee and the House that created it will be striking a blow at the fundamentals of political democracy in these United States. Young people, especially, have got to explore; they must adventure; they must think, and they ought not to be made to feel, as long as they think freely and frankly, openly, sincerely, and honestly, that they are doing anything that is not patriotic. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, when this war shall finally have been won, when 11,000,000 men, mostly mighty young men, come back to this country, unless we do our job remarkably well in preparing for their return, unless we really see that the American market is adequate to consume all the goods that they and others can produce, they are going to think, and they are going to think freely and fearlessly; and they are going to have a right to do so.

I used to be a member of the Dies committee. I voted for the Dies committee, I think, three times; and I voted against it twice. The first time I voted against it was the first time it came up for renewal. Subsequent to that vote, the then Speaker of the House, Hon. William B. Bankhead, appointed me a member of the committee. I served on the com-

mittee until January of 1942. Then I voted against the continuance of the committee for reasons that I thought ample and sufficient, and still do, and I resigned from it. But I am not going into those questions except by indirection today.

Having said what I have so far, I want to make this point. There is a fundamental principle we never can forget. That principle is that any American citizen has a fundamental, moral, and constitutional right to hold any economic, social, or political views he may see fit to hold, whether or not they accord with those of the majority; and the holding of such dissident views does not constitute an un-American activity so long as they are openly and honestly held and so long as the ends sought to be accomplished by such persons are pursued only by open, peaceful, democratic, constitutional means and within the framework of constitutional democracy and majority rule.

That is the first half of the principle. The second half of the principle is as follows:

That freedom of political thought and action is to be distinguished from the actually subversive activities of those who might seek by unconstitutional, undemocratic, and violent methods to undermine constitutional democratic government and substitute, by methods of force, the irresponsible dictatorial rule of a minority.

These latter activities are the things that this committee should concern itself with. But what I greatly fear—and I might as well state it now, because I have seen it happen and I have heard things in this Chamber that have led me to wonder whether it might not happen again—what I frankly fear is that such committee might be used by people not sufficiently informed about the differences between the legitimate exercise of political liberty on the one hand, and subversive activity on the other. I fear that such people might seize such a committee as a convenient method of attempting to identify the honest political views of political opponents with un-American activities, and I say should such a thing take place, it would, in my judgment, render the work of such a committee of little effect in dealing with the real subversive activity it is set up to deal with, and would also constitute a prostitution of what I believe to be a legitimate function of the Congress in a way that I think would be disastrous.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COX. In expressing the gentleman's fears of the function of this new committee that is to be set up, does he not think he is lodging a serious and grievous indictment against his fellows in this body?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not say these things were going to happen. I earnestly hope they never will happen. I said I was afraid of the consequences if they did. I am frank to tell the gentleman that I am making this speech today because I want to make the speech before the personnel of that committee is named, because I want my remarks to be absolutely objective and impersonal,

because I feel I have had some experience in this field, and in it I have worked hard, and because I know there are pitfalls that are hard to avoid. Now may I say, Mr. Speaker, as a progressive, that I think it is just as bad for a progressive to accuse an honest conservative of being a Fascist, as it is for a conservative to accuse an honest progressive of being a Communist, and I think either of those things is an extreme danger to American political life.

Mr. COX. I am taking no serious exception to any observation made by the gentleman. I do wish to say, however, that if there is anyone in this House that has complete confidence in the noble purposes of the gentleman from California, it is myself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman says.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has a profound understanding of these problems, and I am always tremendously impressed by anything the gentleman has to say. The gentleman, I think, is rendering a good service right now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In a moment. Most of the Members will realize that I said it would be due to Members not being adequately informed as to the fundamental distinction I tried to make that this thing might happen. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not have to tell the gentleman from California of my profound reverence for him, and his conscientious attitude on all questions of legislation. But the gentleman awhile ago spoke of men who conscientiously entertain these subversive views.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no, I did not. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will say to the gentleman that there are some who are subversive who probably think they are just as conscientious, and who are just as fanatical in their subversive attitude, probably, as members who are devoted to the cause of constitutional government in America are for their patriotic convictions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have no doubt that is true.

Mr. RANKIN. So I do not believe the gentleman ought to leave this proposition up to what appears to be the conscience of every man who wants to undermine and destroy American institutions. He may be a conscientious fanatic or an enemy sympathizer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not leave it there, I may say to the gentleman; I leave it on this basis: I leave it on the basis that on the one hand American citizens have the right to freedom of political opinion so long as they pursue their ends and hold their opinions in a frank and open fashion and so long as they seek to accomplish those ends only by the free democratic constitutional method of majority rule that our Constitution provides. I tried to draw a distinction between that on the one hand and on the other hand methods that are not open and aboveboard, methods which do not appear upon the surface, methods

which do seek to undermine constitutional democracy by means of force and violence, to interpose in place of majority rule and democracy a dictatorship by force and the rule of the minority. That was the distinction I drew.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Let me just say this, that I am going to yield to all three gentlemen I see standing and then I am going to ask to proceed, because my speech is not going to make good sense unless I finish it, and I have some things here I want to round it out with if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. RICH. I just wanted to ask one question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. RICH. Under the guise of liberty of thought and action is it right and just for an individual to do things that are contrary to our Constitution? When the Dies committee was formed, and the gentleman from California was one of the Members of that committee, they investigated the German Bund. If the committee had never done another thing its investigation of that organization has justified the creation of the committee many times. If they had not shown up the intent and purposes of the Bund that organization would have overthrown this Government. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee for exposing them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now if I may proceed—

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would let me proceed; my time is running out.

Mr. JENNINGS. I will ask that the gentleman be given more time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like about 3 more minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will not need that much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. We all subscribe to the truism that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; and we all, I believe, are sufficiently well informed to know that there is a ceaseless, unrelenting, intelligent attack upon the fundamentals of our Government by a set of subversive people in this country. They are like Carter's little liver pills, they work while we sleep. Does not the gentleman believe that when we are confronted with that kind of attack upon our Constitution there ought to be a standing committee of this House always in position to turn the spotlight of publicity upon them and stop them before it is eternally too late, and save this, the best country on earth?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe, as I said before, that this kind of work is different from the kind of work that should be entrusted to a standing committee of the House. A standing committee of the House is different from a special committee. With all due respect I think this work could better be entrusted to a special committee. It is a job of investigation primarily rather than one of developing and reporting legislation. Legislative committees cannot pass legislation, they can only bring it before the House. But an investigating committee need not get the House's approval. Its work consists of its reports. If the committee is a standing committee the House never will have opportunity to pass judgment upon the work of its committee at all. The creature could become, though I earnestly hope it will not become, greater than the body that created it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to proceed.

Mr. CHURCH. But the gentleman was given more time and he said he would yield to me.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right; I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is doing a fine piece of work. I respect the gentleman's judgment; but does not the gentleman from California believe that Mr. Browder and his kind have a purpose and have in mind the using of force if necessary to accomplish their purpose, and that they have merely postponed that purpose until after this war is over? Essentially do not Mr. Browder and his kind believe in using the force the gentleman has just spoken of? Should not such a committee as this be there to watch that effort?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it should be. But I do not stop there. I will answer that question honestly. I believe it is a fundamental tenet of the Communist and Fascist philosophies that when the critical time comes force will be used to seize power. I think the task of such a committee is to watch both.

Democratic government, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RANKIN. I will get the gentleman more time if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to this situation, which is most disturbing to me: A subversive organization or individual can go out, raise money by the shake-down method, and go into every congressional district in the primary and in the general election and corruptly attempt to defeat Members or to elect unworthy individuals in order to control the Congress of the United States.

I think it is the most dangerous thing I have ever seen attempted or threatened in the whole history of the country. I was one of the men who favored the unseating of Vare and the unseating of Newberry for corrupt expenditures of money, as I believed them, to get in the Senate of the United States. I am not willing for any subversive outfit to adopt the same policies and attempt, by corrupt

methods, to control the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to comment on what the gentleman from Mississippi just said, then I shall refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes in addition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in answering the gentleman from Illinois, I should have said, in addition to what I did, that I believe it is also a fundamental tenet of every anti-democratic philosophy to use force at a certain point when necessary to seize power.

Mr. CHURCH. Of course, your committee did a wonderful piece of work in going into both the Fascist principles and the Communist principles.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Referring to what the gentleman from Mississippi said, I am as opposed as anybody to any coagulation of political power in the hands of any private group in this Nation. May I say to the gentleman, in my own campaign there was an awful lot of money collected and spent, too. That money came from certain sources which were opposed to me, largely, I believe, because of my opposition to monopoly power. My district was blanketed four different times, every home in that district, with literature that told as many untruths about me as were told about the gentleman or any other Member of this House. I am opposed on principle to any organization of any particular group which may seek to control either a political party or the Government of the United States. I am opposed to whoever tries to exercise it. May I say further, however, that just because somebody was against me for Congress does not make that person a subversive or un-American force. They have a right to be against me for Congress; they have the right to spend money to beat me for Congress; they have a right to beat me, if they can. That I do not think is the test. As far as dominating the Government or dominating a political party or anything like that is concerned, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. I will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman, that was a subversive activity. I do not care whether it is a banker or Communist, I would vote to unseat

any Member of this House if it were true that the election had been bought or corruptly controlled by either crowd.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, by their very nature democratic governments must accord political liberty, and such liberty is meaningless unless it extends to minority groups which are out of agreement with the majority and the accepted modes of any given period of time. On the other hand, what is a democratic society supposed to do about people who take advantage of the freedom which it affords in order to destroy that freedom by means other than legitimate democratic political processes? The best answer to this problem that I know lies not in attempts to suppress political thought for such a policy does violate the tenet of democracy itself, and if used against one group it can equally as easily be applied against others. Suppression would ultimately lead almost certainly toward a situation where majorities would resort to it as the easiest method of dealing with minority opposition. It is a type of fire which a democratic government cannot play with. But there is another method which is certainly completely in accord with democratic principles. For the very strength of democracy is to be found in having the people of the Nation fully informed and enabling them to make their political decisions on the basis of all the facts. Therefore it is evident that in attempting to deal with really subversive movements—by which I mean those seeking to substitute totalitarian government by force for democratic government—the obvious method for democracy to use is the method of full exposure of all the facts regarding such movements. The political theory upon which such exposure rests is that if the people know what is going on and what the real purposes of such movements are they will themselves decide against them and thus any advantage which such movement might expect to gain from under-cover activities and secretive methods will be effectively counteracted.

The Congress of the United States is probably the best agency in the Nation to investigate and expose antidemocratic political forces in the United States. It has to be careful that in so doing it does not interdict freedom of political thought, criticism of the status quo, or attempts to improve it.

In my judgment—and I want to be sure I get this in before I close—there are several rules of procedure which such a committee should adopt in order to safeguard its action and to make certain that it does not fall into practices which are going to hurt, mind you, not only this House, not only that committee, but hurt the very effort to separate truly subversive activities on the one hand from perfectly legitimate political activities on the other, and thus play directly into the hands of totalitarian groups themselves. Here are the proposed rules:

First. The committee shall hold regular executive meetings at least once each week.

Second. No public statements, press releases, communications, or reports in-

volving the work and responsibilities of the committee shall be issued or released by any member thereof excepting after such statements, releases, communications, or reports have been submitted to the entire committee and approved by a majority thereof.

Third. Positive effort shall be made by the committee to call before it persons accused of engaging in un-American activities by any witness or member as soon as possible after accusation to this effect has been made.

Fourth. Members of the committee shall make no speeches or public utterances during the course of an investigation which deal with matters currently under investigation; nor shall any charges or predictions as to future findings of the committee be made unless and until substantiated by evidence.

Fifth. The committee shall let the evidence speak for itself. It is unnecessary, unwise, and dangerous for members of a committee of this sort to attempt to dramatize or exaggerate any situation which its investigation may cover.

Those rules are relatively simple. But this power that will be entrusted to this committee may be a power of life and death over the political thinking of American people. It can be as powerful as that. It can be an influence of tremendous weight in political campaigns and elections. If this work is done carefully in accordance with the principles I have tried to lay down, it becomes the most logical answer of a democratic society to dangers from anti-democratic movements which seek gain of power by undemocratic methods. Abused, it will boomerang and defeat its own purpose and utterly and abysmally fail, at the same time bringing danger upon America's fundamental political and constitutional liberties.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. In sustaining the statement last made by the speaker, may I call attention to the fact that this committee was established by almost unanimous vote of the House and turned over to Mr. Dies, in whom we all had absolute confidence. There is no indictment intended by me against Mr. Dies. I merely suggest that evidently while he was in charge the effort was like Phaëthon trying to command the sun chariot and that can happen to a standing committee just as well as it did to a committee specially appointed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman for making the statement that when you have a committee that agrees among its members, that information should not go out without the consent of the committee. But I am going to make this observation that I have been on the committees of the House of Representatives when things were going on in executive session, and I no sooner got out and picked up an evening paper until those things were advertised. I think that no Member of the Congress who is on a com-

mittee that is supposed to be in executive session, where matters are discussed that should be kept secret within that committee, has a right to divulge that information; that as to those things that are said there by the Members, I do not have much confidence in any Member of Congress who goes and rattles it all over until the chairman of that committee is authorized to make the statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I make the observation that the statement of the gentleman from Alabama was a half-handed compliment paid to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Dies. As a matter of fact, it was a stab in the back of the absent Mr. Dies. I am ashamed that the gentleman would take advantage of this situation to make this sort of criticism of a former Member of this body, of whom we are all proud.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Referring to the gentleman's statement awhile ago about muzzling—he did not call it muzzling, but that is what it amounted to—the members of this committee. They ought to have the same freedom, and must have the same freedom, to speak out as members of any other committee. These hearings ordinarily are not held in executive session. If so, the members are honor bound to keep quiet until the proceedings are officially revealed. But where they are open hearings, I see no reason for muzzling the members of this committee any more than you would the members of the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Rules.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If they are open hearings, it would be obviously impossible for this thing to apply. I am not talking about things that happen in open hearings. What I am talking about is this. I am talking about a report that comes in to this committee from some source, a source perhaps not checked carefully by the committee because in the nature of the case it could not be properly checked. I am talking about a report that deals with a certain individual, where that individual has not been heard nor has any evidence on his side of the case been considered. I am talking about the possibility that an individual member of this committee, before there have been any hearings or anything else, can take that report out of the files of the committee, come on the floor of the House, perhaps, and using that unchecked and uncorroborated evidence as the basis of his speech, make an attack on somebody. I do not think that ought to happen. That is what I am talking about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that there is no quarrel between him and me on that point. I do not believe, and I have never believed, in smear campaigns, and I am not in favor of an individual giving out reports that are supposed to be reports of the committee. What I hope we will have is a committee of sound, American-thinking Congressmen who will keep their feet on the ground and who will protect these records and help to protect American institutions, and not try to make it a one-man show or make it an opportunity for self-laudation or publication. I hope we may have a committee that will go to the very root of every one of these subversive activities and expose them to the House, so that we can drive their perpetrators from American soil.

I cannot close without paying my tribute to Martin Dies. Whatever mistake he may have made, this Republic will always owe him a lasting debt of gratitude for his great services as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the patience of the House in listening to me this afternoon. As I said before, I have made this speech only because I feel this is a very important question, and because I believe unless the points I have made are heeded, the action of the House on yesterday may lead to serious consequences.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman knows how much I think of him. I want to praise him highly, but I cannot resist saying that we Republicans would probably sit rather quietly in regard to this matter. That kind of people did not support us.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is there not a danger that the power that will be conferred upon this committee may, under certain conditions, be abused and made an instrument of oppression?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I think it might.

Mr. WHITE. Should not care be exercised to see that the law protects the individual?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the whole point of my speech. That is what I have been talking about this afternoon.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not my opinion that Members on this side of the aisle were supported by subversive people in being elected to Congress. I hope the gentleman did not mean to imply that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I say to you, "You clean house." That is what I say. Everybody knows which party profited by this kind of people. I think you people will clean house and do desire to clean

house. You did not want their support, but you had it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to make one comment at that point. Certainly I think any attempted infiltration of any subversive forces into my party or any other party must be combated with all our strength. So far as my own campaign was concerned, I started it out by saying I did not want the support of any group which expected to dictate to me after it was over. In my district there were not any paid people from any organization who were working there on my side of the fence at any rate. I fought my own campaign on its merits, and as far as my having received support from anybody who might be accused of being subversive, that just did not happen.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield. Mr. RAMEY. I think the word "subversive" is used just like the word "Communist" and sometimes like the word "demagog." A demagog is just the other man making a speech.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. And sometimes some of those other words are used in that same way.

Mr. RAMEY. And in the same fashion, they apply them to anyone.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. May I briefly relate this story? A high-school boy came to see me not very long ago and said, "You know, I get the impression that a Communist is a man who is interested in the under dog because I hear people accused of that all the time, who seem to have such an interest." Now I say to the House, that is a very dangerous idea to have implanted in the young man's mind. It is a very dangerous thing for him not to be able to make a distinction in that respect. But it certainly is no fault of his. When names like that are used, they ought to be used extremely carefully, to mean precisely what they actually do mean, instead of being bandied about purely for political campaign purposes.

Mr. RAMEY. When a man is too lazy to think, he calls people demagogues, Fascists, and Communists, and things like that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Precisely. The gentleman from Ohio has supplied at least as effective a conclusion to my speech as I could have done myself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SWEAR IN A MEMBER

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 49), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas JAMES V. HEIDINGER, a Representative-elect from Illinois, from the Twenty-fourth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of

office to said JAMES V. HEIDINGER, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES V. HEIDINGER.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NO PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one time in the history of the Nation that we should have less partisan politics than we have had heretofore. At this very minute upon the 55 battle fronts of the world we have American soldiers. The sun does not set on the American soldier today. We have over 6,000,000 fighting men in foreign lands and upon the high seas. They are offering to give their last drop of blood in order to save our country during this, the greatest war in all history. It is my hope that we will lay aside, as much as possible, partisan politics during this awful conflict. Let us hope that we will have the kind of unity that the Speaker of the House pleaded for on yesterday.

For that reason I am willing to not only give, but I am willing to take. I am not willing to engage in any carping criticism or any other devastating criticism of our allies and friends, who are fighting shoulder to shoulder with our boys upon the battlefields of the world. I do not think this is any time for us to try to tell Mr. Stalin, or Mr. Churchill, or Mr. Roosevelt as to exactly how they should not only run the war during the war but as to what they should do after the war is won. I think we should first devote our entire time and attention, with as little disunity as possible, in working with all of our allies to win the war, and then try to obtain a lasting peace.

I enjoyed the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. He is one of the ablest and most sincere Members of this body. I also enjoyed the speeches made by our friends on the other side of the aisle, although some parts of their speeches involved or included criticisms. The time, I hope, will never come in a democracy when we should try to prevent criticism. I think we should always have it. Constructive criticism should always be welcome, and I hope while this war is going on we will be careful with our words of criticism, and make sure they are based on facts, and not half truths.

KEEP DOWN EXPENDITURES

I invite attention to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], whom we are all glad to welcome back as a Member of this body, and who often gives a thought-provoking suggestion which we appreciate and enjoy, a while ago mentioned some things I am afraid might go out to the public in such a way that some people will misunderstand them. Possibly I am not able or qualified to criticize his statements, so I am not going to criticize them, but am going to comment upon them. He said that we should keep down the amount of expenditures. I agree with him on that.

We should keep them down just as much as possible. We should not spend one dime or one penny of the taxpayers' money that is not absolutely necessary. We should not permit the waste of one penny. So I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich]. He said we should abolish all unnecessary boards and commissions. With that I agree. We should have just as few employees as possible. He said also that we should do everything we can to win this war. I agree with him in that, and that we should practice economy in government.

CANNOT BALANCE THE BUDGET DURING WAR

I do not agree, as he inferred we should, that we should absolutely balance the Budget during this war, because that cannot be done. There is where I take issue with him. I invite attention to the fact that 97 cents of every dollar that is authorized to be expended and appropriated by the Congress during this war has been used for war purposes, and only 3 cents used in our domestic affairs and in government.

CONGRESS COSTS 1½ CENTS PER PERSON PER MONTH

A lot of people talk about the enormous expense of the National Congress, the lawmaking body. I invite your attention to the fact that the cost of the entire lawmaking body—that is, including the House, and Senate, and our investigation committees, all committees, and clerks, and all legislative expenses of every kind and nature, including all salaries and expenses—amounts to only 1½ cents per person per month. So when you come to balance the Budget with things like that, you cannot do it. When you analyze other expenditures, you run into the same difficulty. You cannot balance a hundred cents on the dollar with only 3 cents to go on. Therefore, we should not expect to absolutely balance the Budget during this war.

HIGHER TAXES WOULD BE JUSTIFIED

I believe in higher taxes right now, and I would vote for higher taxes.

I think it is right that we should pay as much of the cost of this war as we go along as it is possible. Every dollar that is not paid now is borrowed on long-term bonds, and the history of long-term bonds is that by the time you have paid the long-term bonds you have paid a dollar in interest for every dollar you have borrowed; so I believe in paying just as much of this debt as we go along as possible, because every dollar we pay now is the equivalent of paying \$2. So why should not we be for it? Furthermore, it is unfair to the 11,900,000 fighting men to have them go upon the battlefields of the world and save our country and then come back and have to pay double the cost of winning the war themselves. It is unfair to them. We should therefore pay every dollar it is possible to pay as we go along.

Another reason why we should pay is that we have tens of billions of dollars of excess purchasing power floating around, the most serious menace, from an inflationary standpoint, facing our country today; and the more taxes we pay as we are able to pay them the more money we are siphoning off in the form of danger-

ous dollars that will assist us in preventing inflation. There are three good reasons why I believe we should pay just as much of the cost of this war as we go as it is possible for us to pay.

COUNTRY CANNOT GO BANKRUPT

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that our country was drifting into bankruptcy. I know we often use a word like that loosely, and I have probably used it in a loose way myself in years gone by; but in truth and in fact our country cannot go bankrupt; it is absolutely impossible. Bankruptcy presupposes inability to pay a debt or debts. The time will never come when this Government will not be able to pay its debts. The problem is the value of the money with which the Government will pay those debts; there is the point we should watch; there is the problem we should solve, the value of that money.

PRICE CONTROL HAS WORKED

Today, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history we have a program that has actually worked to prevent inflation. I know it has caused some irritations, annoyances, and sometimes hardships and troubles, but it has actually worked—price control. We made a mistake by not putting it into effect long before we did, but we certainly did the right thing by putting it into effect when we did; and, inconvenient and troublesome as it may have been in its enforcement in many ways, irritating and annoying as it may have been, our country would have been absolutely ruined without it.

DUTY OF CONGRESS TO FAMILIES OF FIGHTING MEN

We owe a duty not only to the people who work for wages and salaries, and whose livelihood depends upon fixed incomes from any source, to keep that dollar as stable as possible so it will purchase for them a decent living for a reasonable number of dollars, but we also owe a duty to those 11,900,000 men whom we have caused to go forth to war. Many of them have left wives and children back here at home and dependent fathers and mothers. After they go to war, if we have uncontrolled prices and ruinous inflation, and the amount of money that we have provided for the protection of their families while they are gone, the allowances they make, supplemented by what the Government gives by an act of Congress, if we do not protect those war dollars to the extent that that amount of money will purchase for that soldier's family a decent standard of living, we are falling down on our job to that serviceman. It is our duty, therefore, not only in the interest of the people of this country but in the interest of the dependents and loved ones of those men who are fighting our battles in the war today to keep the cost of living down to the extent that the money they have will buy for them an adequate and decent standard of living. So we owe that obligation.

PEOPLE WILL NOT WORK FOR WORTHLESS MONEY

Now, we will not have bankruptcy; we as a nation will always pay our debts; but if we pay them with cheap money, we destroy our country; we destroy the purchasing power of the people. Inflation can cause us to lose this war if we

keep on putting too much money in circulation, adding to the stock of money until the money is practically worthless and will not buy anything if price control should break down. Do you think the workers are going into the factory and work 8 or 12 hours a day for money that is no good? Of course they will not.

If we do not protect the dollar and the cost of living, we can cause the war to be lost right here at home. There is our problem—not bankruptcy, because we as a nation will not go bankrupt if we protect our dollars to the extent that a dollar will buy what it should, what people want to buy for the benefit of themselves.

YES; PRODUCE FOOD FOR OUR ALLIES

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] said that we are called upon to raise food for our allies. I know that statement has been made sometimes in a critical way, ridiculing the administration and those of us who are trying to encourage the production of food, because some of it is to go to our allies.

Let us analyze this situation briefly. Do we want to produce food for our allies? Of course we do. We are anxious to. We have good reasons for doing it. Let me tell you what those reasons are. The farmers of this country have done a magnificent job with labor shortage, machinery shortage, and everything else confronting them and handicapping them in their effort. In spite of all this they have produced 25 percent more food last year than ever before in the history of our country.

Why do we want that food? In the first place, these 12,000,000, approximately, fighting men must have the finest and best food on earth. Each one of them must have an average of 4,500 calories of food each day, about twice as much as the average civilian consumes; 5½ pounds of food per day, twice as much as the average civilian consumes. That means that we must set aside 65,000,000 pounds of food every day for the benefit of our fighting men in order to give them the finest and best food on earth, the kind of food that will fill the stomachs and stick to the ribs of the men, the best food in the world.

In order to do that, rationing was and is absolutely necessary. Then we have to feed the civilian population. We do not want a few people hoarding certain foods like sugar and requiring the other people to pay 35 cents and 50 cents a pound for it like they had to do in the First World War. We want to divide it up and give each person an opportunity to have enough food in order to protect the health of the people and prevent the morale of the people of the country from being broken down. Rationing was necessary for that purpose. Then if some is left we send it to our allies. Why should we not send it to our allies? Every time you furnish food to China, and a Chinaman takes that food, goes out and kills a Jap, there is one less Jap to kill an American soldier. Every time we send food over to Russia and a Russian takes that food and goes out and kills a German there is one less German to kill an American soldier. So that through our lend-lease policy and through our policy of furnishing food to

our allies we have saved the lives of American boys and more American boys will return to the vacant chairs in the homes and before the firesides here in America. So it is absolutely justified, needed, desirable; every one should want to do it; yes, raise food for our allies, because every time we do we save the lives of American boys.

DEBT BIG BUT CASUALTY LIST COMPARATIVELY LOW

It was further mentioned that our debt was awfully big. One member stated it looked like we would never be able to pay back that debt. I do not agree with him at all. It can be paid with honest dollars. The higher it gets the harder it will be to pay, but it will not be hard if we can keep our national income up. If we do not keep our national income up, it will be awfully hard to pay. Remember this, that the people paid more in taxes in 1944 than the entire aggregate national income was in 1932, so they can pay a debt like it is today easier, with less inconvenience, than they could have paid the low debt of 1932 during the year 1932. Please do not accept that as an argument for a high debt. I am just analyzing the situation as it actually exists.

Let me tell you something more about this big debt. When this war started there were some people in this country who would have liked to have had a cheap war; use men, save dollars. Fortunately the other side prevailed. The other side was that we should spend dollars and save men. That is what this Congress has done. That is what this administration has stood for. That is what I am for. Save every man you can, regardless of how much it costs us. We can replace dollars, but we cannot replace men. So the people who wanted a cheap war were overruled, and those who wanted to spend every cent they could spend for armor, for ammunition, for equipment which would help us bring back those fighting brave men and save those lives, although it cost money, pursued that course. That is what we want to do. In other words, our policy was never send a man to do a dangerous job when a machine could be sent to do the same job, although that machine cost money. Yes; we have a high national debt, but our casualty lists have been comparatively low by reason thereof.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. I am astonished at the gentleman's statement that there were people in this country that wanted to fight a war that would be cheap in money and costly in human life. May I ask the gentleman to elucidate?

Mr. PATMAN. I said there were people in this country who wanted a cheap war, and I think you can read the newspapers today and see criticism of the war expenditures and you cannot come to any other conclusion but what they are willing to have a cheaper war and it might cost the lives of American boys.

Mr. LEWIS. Would the gentleman care to name some of those people?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. I am not here to discuss personalities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I would not care to impugn the motives of any person by reason of any statement he makes. I am certainly not going to impugn the motives of any Member of this House. I have great respect for every Member of this body, and the gentleman has never heard me question the motives of any Member of this body, and I never shall. It is the duty of every Member here who represents about 300,000 people himself to represent them in the way and manner he thinks he should represent them. It is not for me to criticize him and I never shall. It is for him to decide. Yes; over 3,000,000 Federal employees, but how many unnecessary?

There was another statement made here today about the number of Federal employees, to the effect there were more than 3,000,000 so employed. That is a true statement; there is no question about that. What if we have more than 3,000,000 employees? But let it be said that all those employees are necessary. Maybe there are some unnecessary ones. If there are, they should be discharged; we do not want them; we do not need them. But of these 3,000,000 employees over 1,000,000 are working for the Army, doing absolutely necessary work, including the making of arms and ammunition. If they were not in the civil service among these 3,000,000 doing war work, we would have to induct other people to take their jobs. Is it not better that they remain as they are, doing vital, necessary work, although not in uniform, than to induct people to do their work? So there are 1,000,000 working for the Army that are necessary of these 2,000,000 Federal employees.

Another 1,000,000 of those 3,000,000 are working for the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps, and doing other just as necessary work. There are 2,000,000 of those 3,000,000 right there, two-thirds that no person would say should be discharged; not one. So when we talk about 3,000,000 employees, we should stop and consider that we have a war on and that two-thirds of these employees we know are absolutely necessary in war work, and we would not discharge one of them.

Now, what about the other million? We have about 400,000 in the Postal Service. Do you want to discharge them? No, they are necessary. We have several hundred thousand others in our Government service who are just as necessary as the Postal Service, including doctors, nurses, Veterans Administration employees and others. You would not discharge them. When you get right down to the point of which ones you are going to discharge, the number in dispute is not very large.

Still, I insist, if we have any unnecessary employees in any agency of our Gov-

ernment, they should not continue to receive the taxpayers' money, but that does not mean that we have 3,000,000 unnecessary employees, often referred to as stooges and bureaucrats, and any other name that happens to come to the mind of the person who is trying to condemn them. They should not be condemned in wholesale, and they are not entitled to be, because they are engaged in fine work that is necessary in the prosecution of this war. Many of them are remaining in Government service during the war at a great personal sacrifice.

May I state in conclusion that I express the hope that in this session of the Congress which has just commenced, in view of the serious situation that is confronting the people of this country and our fine brave fighting men, we should have just as little partisan politics as possible, preferably none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ALLIED WAR AIMS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the various messages that were delivered here this afternoon and the sincerity with which they were delivered by the various Members. I cannot help but honestly believe that there is a far graver problem facing this Congress than any that has been mentioned thus far. No one will deny that there is confusion throughout the United States of America and I might say throughout the entire world, vast confusion as to just exactly what our war aims are, especially pertaining to the European theater of operations. That confusion has come to a state where it has almost resulted, in my judgment, in chaos. The recent sad fate of Poland, one of our most gallant allies, and the recent scuttling of the Atlantic Charter, in my judgment, have brought about a condition where chaos prevails throughout the world as to just what the war aims of the Allied Nations are supposed to be.

As a result of those two sad incidents, the scuttling of the Atlantic Charter and the carving up of Poland, one of our most gallant allies, I have received and I know every Member of this Congress has received letters from wives, mothers, parents, sisters, and brothers of the boys who have given their lives, asking this question, "Just what did they die for?" pertaining, of course, to the European theater of war.

I have done a little thinking on that subject and a little research, and I am of the honest judgment that the Seventy-eighth Congress has failed in its duty and its responsibility. I have learned, for instance, by intensive study that it is not the duty or responsibility of anybody or any organization or any other department of our Government to declare the aims of war, other than the Congress of the United States of America, according to our Constitution. I

have heard for the past 2 years much criticism here by Members of Congress denouncing the President of the United States, that his war aims are not clear.

I have heard a lot of criticism here on both sides of the aisle, denouncing our State Department, that our war aims are not crystal clear. But we have not denounced ourselves, where the responsibility lies. The power to declare war lies solely and sacredly in the hands of the Congress of the United States of America. With that power also goes the responsibility and sacred obligation to tell what it is that we are fighting for. So in answer to these hundreds of letters I am receiving and which other Members of Congress are receiving as to the statement of our war aims, I have introduced today a resolution, meeting that responsibility of this Congress, a resolution which definitely and concretely and concisely states what our war aims are. I submit to you, that if the Members study my resolution, and if you see fit to support it, I will appreciate it and I know millions of boys and girls who are risking their lives will appreciate it also, if we tell them just what it is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Saturday, January 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

37. A letter from the Secretary, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting the records omitted from the copy of the fifteenth bimonthly report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

38. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, dated December 18, 1944, forwarding statements of the cost of manufacture at the armory and arsenals named therein, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

39. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, the War Relocation Authority, and Headquarters Army Service Forces, relative to moneys received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, which were not paid into the general fund of the United States Treasury, and the payments, if any, made from such moneys during such fiscal year; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

40. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certificates from the executives of 31 States, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in these States on November 7, 1944;

to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

42. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certificates from the executives of Arizona and California certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in these States on November 7, 1944; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report on all operations under the act of April 5, 1944 (Public Law No. 290), authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels for the period July 1 to December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

44. A letter from the Chairman of the Board for the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of expenditures for the 12 months ended November 30, 1944, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

45. A letter from the secretary of state of Maryland, transmitting a certified copy of the Governor's proclamation declaring the election of Representatives in the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States from the six congressional districts of Maryland; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

46. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan, with a view to the establishment of a harbor at the most suitable site, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

47. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Manokin River, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 4, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

48. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Murphy & Wischmeyer against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

49. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, the moneys received, if any, and an account thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

50. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

51. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

52. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective

compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on Accounts.

53. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of \$500 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H. R. 671. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 672. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 673. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 674. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 675. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act, 1942, with respect to maximum prices in the case of cattle on the hoof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 676. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 677. A bill to suspend the immigration of aliens into the United States from the end of hostilities of the present war until the number of unemployed persons, including United States war veterans, within the United States is less than 1,000,000; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 678. A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint and sale with respect to Federal taxes as are allowed under the applicable State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 679. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 680. A bill to provide for grants to the States for assistance to needy incapacitated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 681. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 682. A bill to increase certain allowances provided by law for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 683. A bill to provide that Federal grants for old-age assistance shall match State contributions four to one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 684. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to

permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 686. A bill relating to the labeling of boric acid for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 688. A bill to amend the joint resolution of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 690. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States," approved April 13, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 692. A bill to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the British Government for and on behalf of John Bailey, former stoker of His Majesty's ship *Orion*, in full and final settlement of a claim arising as a consequence of injuries inflicted by John Ittner, United States Navy, at Seattle, Wash., on July 16, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 693. A bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 695. A bill to extend to veterans the right to appeal their claims within 2 years after denial; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 696. A bill to provide for judicial determination governing the discontinuance of insurance granted on account of permanent total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 697. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 698. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 699. A bill to amend paragraph 682 of title 16 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 700. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color,

national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 701. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 702. A bill to provide that nominal income from personal services may be disregarded in computing payments to be made as old-age assistance and aid to the blind under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 703. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits provided by such act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 704. A bill to amend title III, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 705. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 706. A bill to extend to 2 years the time for filing applications for review of claims on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 707. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 708. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents for business accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 709. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing that citizens of former neutral countries shall become eligible for military service when their countries cease to be neutral; making eligible for naturalization aliens who claimed exemption as citizens of neutral countries and who subsequently serve honorably in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 710. A bill making it a Federal offense to alter the inner surface of the hand for the purpose of preventing identification by the use of fingerprints; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill to require certain naturalized and derivative citizens of the United States to take an oath of allegiance; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 712. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 713. A bill for the creation of medical academies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 714. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizens, men and women, who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 715. A bill to provide the transfer by the Secretary of War of the Roseburg rifle range, Douglas County, Oreg., to the Defense Plant Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 716. A bill to amend the joint resolution of July 29, 1941, relating to the removal of officers from the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 717. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 718. A bill to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 719. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 720. A bill to prohibit certain subsidy, indemnity, and other payments with respect to short staple cotton and commodities manufactured from such cotton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 721. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the rating schedules so as to provide total ratings for the most severe functional nervous diseases or psychoneurotic states; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 722. A bill to provide for judicial determination governing the discontinuance of insurance granted on account of permanent total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 723. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 724. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 725. A bill to provide for retirement as chief warrant officer, upon retirement for disability after 20 years' service or after 30 years' service, of those enlisted personnel who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 1 and No. 2 and who held commissions during those wars and later reverted to their enlisted status; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 726. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 727. A bill to provide for the delivery of mail on rural free delivery routes on holidays other than Sundays; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 728. A bill to provide for the loss of the United States nationality under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 729. A bill to increase by 20 percent the rates of pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans Administration to veterans who served on foreign soil or in foreign waters in any war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 730. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 731. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 732. A bill to permit civilian defense volunteers to retain on the cessation of civilian defense activities certain equipment issued by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 733. A bill to provide that World War veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 734. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 735. A bill to provide monthly payments for unemployed veterans of the present war for a limited period after separation from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 736. A bill to authorize the acceptance by Federal agencies of a certification from the records of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as to place and date of birth of a veteran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 737. A bill to insure appropriate non-commissioned rank and retirement privileges to certain enlisted persons of the Regular Establishment who serve during the present war in a temporary commissioned status and who return to enlisted status; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 738. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 739. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits under certain conditions to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 740. A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, as amended, with respect to the authority of the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 741. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 742. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 743. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 744. A bill authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 745. A bill to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 746. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PAGE:

H. R. 747. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conservation of national soil resources and to provide an adequate and balanced flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce,

and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 748. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 749. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 750. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 20 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 751. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 752. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 753. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 754. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 755. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 756. A bill amending section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, in order to provide for the maintenance and operation of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 757. A bill to provide for the discharge and cancellation of certain loans made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of capital stock in agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 758 (by request). A bill to provide for the development of better diets and an improved nutritional status for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 759. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 760. A bill relating to certain proceedings in the district courts of the United States where property is requisitioned under the act of October 16, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 761. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 762. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drain-

age works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 763. A bill to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 764. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 765. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 766. A bill granting equipment allowance to postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 767. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowances for railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 768. A bill to authorize the naturalization of native-born Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States and Filipinos who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 769. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research and Development in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 770. A bill to establish a National War Memorial Auditorium Commission, to provide for construction and maintenance of a National War Memorial Auditorium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 771. A bill to amend section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 by revising the basis and rate of retired pay of members of the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 772. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act with regard to taxation of real property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 773. A bill to authorize State and local taxation of land, improvements, and appurtenances thereto, and all machinery disposed of by the Government in any manner whatsoever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 774. A bill to make permanent the rate of postage on mailable matter of the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 775. A bill to provide an increase in pay for the personnel of the military and naval forces engaged in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGEEHEE:

H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 777. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damages for personal injury or death or for damage to or loss or destruction of property caused by service personnel or civilian employees or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 778. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 779. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to prepare plans for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in 1946 of the signing and publication of Washington's Farewell Address; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OKONSKI:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to state war aims of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint responsibility for the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution providing for restoration of property confiscated by the Axis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution declaring it to be un-American to participate in activities to create racial or religious disunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an equal rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the passage of bills after Presidential veto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to correct an error in section 342 (b) (9) of the National-Act of 1940, as amended by the act of September 27, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between Italy and the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 47. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to make an investigation of the present system of taking, producing, canning, processing, marketing, transporting, and distributing of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to create a special committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of race relations in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 51. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the question of the feasibility of conferring upon the Price Administrator the power to fix rentals for the occupancy of business premises in defense-rental areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to study the basic problems affecting post-war immigration and naturalization; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution to provide for the temporary admission of political or religious refugees of continental Europe into areas within the United States to be known as free ports for refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the

present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. Res. 55. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Vonnie Jones, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 781. A bill for the relief of Douglas Charles McRae, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 782. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in New Mexico to Henry Lopez; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Karl E. Bond; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 784. A bill for the relief of Maja Platzer; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 785. A bill for the relief of the widow of William A. Nelson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 786. A bill for the relief of D. T. George; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 787. A bill for the relief of Murray B. Latimer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of the city of Red Wing, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 789. A bill for the relief of Rev. and Mrs. E. F. Wachholz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 790. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 791. A bill for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 792. A bill for the relief of the Fair Haven Yacht Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 793. A bill expediting the naturalization of Pierre Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 794. A bill expediting the naturalization of Mary Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Marie A. Atanasio; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 796. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and for Charles L. Stover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 797. A bill for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 798. A bill for the relief of Carrol I. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 799. A bill for the relief of Pauline Smallwood; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 800. A bill for the relief of Frank Carter, father of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; and K. Kenneth Keithley, father of Donald Keithley, a minor; and K. Kenneth Keithley and Coleman H. Keithley, trading as Keithley Bros. Garage, Joppa, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 802. A bill for the relief of Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 803. A bill to expedite the naturalization of Monica Warfield; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 805. A bill granting a pension to Nina G. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 806. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mabel K. Young; the Hagerstown Hosiery Co., Inc.; John R. Fisher; and the Central Insurance Co. of Baltimore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of John Burl Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 808. A bill for the relief of James F. Mellon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 809. A bill granting a pension to Alice G. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 810. A bill for the relief of Maria Stern, Arpad Stern, Elizabeth Spitz, Maximilian Spitz, and Claude Marguerite Spitz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of Hans Oppenheimer and his wife Marga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Moses Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of Mor (Morris) Honig, his wife Francisca (Francesca), and their sons, Vilmos (William) and Pal (Paul); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 814 (by request). A bill authorizing the appointment of James T. Simpson as major in the Chaplain Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 815. A bill for the relief of Frederic Gruder and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of Merrill M. Marks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 818. A bill to extend emergency officers' retirement benefits to Raymond B. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 820. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Riverside St. Clair Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Gussie Hart and Louis Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 822. A bill for the relief of Horace W. Goodsmith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of William Beyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Antonino Capello; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Mendel Hoffmann and his wife Rosa Hoffmann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 826. A bill for the relief of Markus Preminger, his wife Josefa, and son Ingwald; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Clarence Mulligan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Manuel Maiz y Humara; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 829. A bill for the relief of John J. Berton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 830. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emma Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of Eisik Goldmann, Czarne Goldmann, Lilly and Guidon

Goldmann, Hersz Arbermann Hausman, Augusta Laura Hausman, Joseph Hausman, and Edgar David Hausman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 832. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Bial, Brete Bial, Ernest Bial, and Ottilie Bial; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 833. A bill granting an increase of pension to Walter Clement Haigh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 834. A bill granting a pension to Sophie Pincus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 835. A bill granting a pension to Isiah J. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 836. A bill granting a pension to Sarah Foxton Judson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 839. A bill for the relief of Sarah Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandro Nasco Echegaray; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 841. A bill for the relief of Lander H. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie L. Dance, Michigan Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., and State Farm Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Hanley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of S. H. Kress & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Richard Schulz, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 849. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Medal to Albert W. J. Johnsen, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Betty Jane Ritter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 854. A bill for the relief of Isabel Carlson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 855. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 856. A bill for the relief of Frances Biewer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 857. A bill granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 858. A bill for the relief of H. Ward Eaton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 859. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 860. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Tannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 861. A bill granting an increase in pension to Maryette Vannatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 862. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 863. A bill granting a pension to Isabelle Walton Prentice; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 864. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 865. A bill for the relief of Edgar D. Sebring and Jay Purple; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 866. A bill granting a pension to Clarinda E. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 867. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Knickerbocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 868. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 869. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha K. Holcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 871. A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of H. J. Hickman and P. G. Hickman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Nannie Bass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of L. A. Holcombe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Lamar Porter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 878. A bill for the relief of the York Products, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 879. A bill for the relief of Ed Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 880. A bill to grant an honorable discharge certificate from the military service of the United States to Lyle Edwin Dew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 882. A bill for the relief of Valley Savings Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of John F. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 884. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Horace Leslie Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of Domenic Salvi; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Domenic Salvi; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Oshansky; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Joseph Oshansky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 889. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arens and David Arens, of New York City, doing business under the name of Dee Jay Hat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 891. A bill to provide for the issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to Andrew J. Bissinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Madeline J. MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 893. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 895. A bill to provide for the appointment of Julius P. Uihlein 3d, as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Charles Myers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Athan Peter Brakoulis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 899. A bill authorizing the President to bestow the decoration of the Purple Heart upon Thomas Anthony Deleo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 900. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 902. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Myles Perz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 904. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of the City Service Transit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Marion Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 910. A bill for the relief of David E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Ruth Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 914. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 80, Pratt County, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of William Ralph Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 920. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of Charles Palmer Cornwell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 923. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catharine Ribel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 924. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Primm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 925. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 926. A bill granting an increase of pension to Alice Dunfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 927. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 928. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adabelle Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 929. A bill granting an increase of pension to Judah A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 931. A bill for the relief of Verne V. Gunsolley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Margaret Gudzin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 934. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Andreas Andersen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of John Niselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amanda Townsend; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of William A. Hammond; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 942. A bill granting a pension to Bell D. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 943. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Hinton; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of the San Pedro Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of Fred Clouse; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 947. A bill to reinstate E. Lewis Field, United States Army, retired, to the active list

of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 948. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Rirg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 950. A bill for the relief of F. V. Johnson, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of Chester R. Dukas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Pedro Garcia Casanova Melquiades Rojas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Charles Albert Goetz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 956. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Joe Koor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 960. A bill to correct the military record of Thomas J. Parrott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Smith Hayden; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Henry O. Heuer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Marie Vickers and Irene Outten; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 964. A bill for the relief of William H. Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of John K. Carey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Henderson Stewart; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 967. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Fred McGarrahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 969. A bill granting an increase of pension to Florence S. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 970. A bill to confirm the claims of Charles Gaudet under Spanish patents to section 18, township 11 south, range 5 east, and section 21, township 12 south, range 5 east, St. Helena meridian, Parish of St. James, State of Louisiana, together with all accretion; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Philomene Paasch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Justine Englert Dolan and the legal guardian of Frederick S. Englert, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Smith and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of the members of the crew of the United States dredge *Galveston*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Chet Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Ralph J. Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGEEHEE:

H. R. 979. A bill for the relief of S'gurdur Jonsson and Thorolinda Thordardottir; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 980. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 981. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 982. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 983. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 985. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 986. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Ralph P. Aiello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 990. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 991. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 992. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 993. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 994. A bill granting an increase of pension to William E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 995. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray, and their resultant dismissal, and to reinstate Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray as privates, Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Elisha Mack Rabon, Mrs. E. S. Gasque, and Dottie Elaine Gasque; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of A. L. Fauls Planograph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 998. A bill granting an increase of pension to Almira Hemingway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Lily L. Carren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 1000. A bill for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1001. A bill granting an increase of pension to Albert Steinhauser; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Martin V. Fay; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1004. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Olsen, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Elvera Galasso; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1006. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brown Waggoner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriette E. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund, State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1011. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Eugene Allen and Mrs. Gail Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of Richard Macleod Hull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1018. A bill granting a pension to J. L. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of John R. Page; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daniel A. Brinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of F. J. Rozier; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1023. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Vingerhagen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Wallace L. Edenfield; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of Hosea Aldred; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1027. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1028. A bill for the relief of Henry Burch Montford, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1029. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1030. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1031. A bill for the relief of Mathew Mattas; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1032. A bill for the relief of Nellie Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1033. A bill for the relief of Marlon Hobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of the Royal Exchange Assurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of the Stiers Brothers Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of Leonard M. Gluck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of William D. McCauley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1041. A bill to permit naturalization of Mrs. Susie Demeter; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Monongalia County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Allen P. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of The Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1045. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1046. A bill granting an increase of pension to Edith M. Link; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1047. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1048. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lorena M. Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1049. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1050. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Millsbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1051. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1052. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jenettie E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of the Clark Memorial Masonic Association of Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis and Nicholas Kavalaris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of the Realty Bond and Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1056. A bill for the relief of the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of S. B. Norton & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Reed Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1064. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Hunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of Bart B. Pigman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1066 (by request). A bill to provide for a money grant to Harriet F. Wright in recognition of the valuable services rendered to the United States by her late husband; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of the estate of, and/or the heirs at law of, Frank D. Howells, former treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Elmer C. Hadlen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1071. A bill for the relief of John Taylor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Henry R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbar; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Person; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of Sprague B. Wyman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1076. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1077. A bill granting a pension to Marjorie Scott, widow of the late Rear Admiral Norman Scott, United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Ray L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Nesbitt and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1081. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1082. A bill granting a pension to Dellar Milam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Eddie Bessire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of the Eastern Contracting Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Albert Cantalupo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Grim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1092. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Devo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 1093. A bill to award the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously to First Lt. Clovis Moomaw; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, who art love and light and truth, we turn unfilled to Thee. In a world where the very foundations seem to be shaken and the mad fury of battle assails our senses and tears our hearts, we cherish this hushed and hallowed moment which so long ago the founding fathers set apart as an altar of prayer at the day's beginning. Here, bowing with contrite hearts, we would be sure of Thee and of spiritual resources before we go to meet the high solemnities of waiting tasks.

Enlarge our sympathies. Deepen our compassion and our pity. Save our sacred cause from the poison of misunderstandings. Forbid that fogs and shadows rising out of the fever and panic of these tense times should dim our unity. When we are tempted by petty annoyances, by despondency, by resentments, and by the angry emotions of the world, may we gaze tenderly at the gaping wounds of our Allies and remember with gratitude that in our favored land not one steeple has fallen, not one temple has been demolished, not one home is in ruins. Ennoble our spirits so that through us may be preserved for all mankind the ideals of the Republic, to the glory of the God who hath made and preserved us a nation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

OWEN BREWSTER, a Senator from the State of Maine; STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; and HIRAM W. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in their seats today.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, had been elected Clerk of the House of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session on Saturday, January 6, 1945, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, supra, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WORLEY and Mr. GAMBLE tellers on the part of the House to ascertain and count the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate three letters from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the certificates of the Governors of the States of Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election of November 7, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES AND RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and

ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 6th day of January 1945, immediately following the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President, as provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the concurrent resolution provides for a joint meeting following the counting and announcement of the result of the electoral votes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. We discovered that the joint session provided for in the concurrent resolution adopted Wednesday to take place at 1 o'clock today was for the purpose only of counting the electoral votes. Without the concurrent resolution now presented by me the Senate and House could not remain in joint session officially for the purpose of receiving the President's message. It is for that purpose that the resolution is offered.

Mr. WHITE. Then, for the joint meeting for the purpose of counting the electoral votes, we are proceeding under statutory authority and a concurrent resolution is not required for that?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate has just received a message from the House announcing its concurrence in the Senate concurrent resolution providing for counting the electoral votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the matter of counting the electoral votes the Senate is proceeding under Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. That resolution has already been agreed to by the Senate and by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has already been agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that is all taken care of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has action been taken on the concurrent resolution submitted by me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No action has been taken as yet. Without objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by the Senator from Kentucky, is agreed to.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by direction of the Democratic conference, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.